



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 6, 2016

Mr. Josh Marcum
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-20099

Dear Mr. Marcum:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 625161 (Ref. No. W052676).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for a specified investigation file. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note in correspondence to this office dated May 12, 2016, the city informed this office it released most of the information you have submitted for our review in this instance in response to an earlier public information request. Additionally, in this same correspondence, the city requested a ruling on the submitted incident detail report, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-12840 (2016). In this ruling, we determined, in relevant part, that the city must release the submitted incident detail report. You now seek to withhold information the city voluntarily released in response to the previous request and the submitted incident detail report ordered released in the previous ruling under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We note, however, section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body*

may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the city may not now withhold any of the submitted information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. Although the city raises section 552.108, it is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108). As such, this section does not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. Thus, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.108. However, because sections 552.101, 552.1085, and 552.130 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office also has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

disclosure.² *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3.

However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Thus, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1085 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(c) A sensitive crime scene image in the custody of a governmental body is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 and a governmental body may not permit a person to view or copy the image except as provided by this section. This section applies to any sensitive crime scene image regardless of the date that the image was taken or recorded.

Gov't Code § 552.1085(c). For purposes of section 552.1085, “sensitive crime scene image” means “a photograph or video recording taken at a crime scene, contained in or part of a closed criminal case, that depicts a deceased person in a state of dismemberment, decapitation, or similar mutilation or that depicts the deceased person's genitalia.” See *id.* § 552.1085(a)(6). You inform us the requested investigation file pertains to a closed criminal investigation. Upon review, we find the photographs we have marked depict a deceased individual and consist of sensitive crime scene images that were taken at a crime scene as part of a criminal case that is now closed. Further, we note none of the exceptions in section 552.1085 apply in this instance. Accordingly, the city must withhold the photographs we have marked under section 552.1085(c) of the Government Code.

²Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See id.* § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects privacy interests. As noted above, the right of privacy lapses at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229, H-917; ORD 272. Therefore, motor vehicle record information that pertains solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.130. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the photographs we have marked under section 552.1085(c) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.³

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

³We note the remaining information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *See Gov't Code* § 552.147(b). However, the requestor has a right of access to his own social security number and it may not be withheld from him under section 552.147 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a).

Ref: ID# 625161

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)