



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 13, 2007

Ms. Meredith Ladd  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2007-10341

Dear Ms. Ladd:

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# 286412.

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a named individual and specific incidents. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

The submitted documents contain information that is considered highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate concern to the public. In most cases, the city would be allowed to withhold only this information; however, in this instance the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved and the nature of the incidents at issue. Withholding

only certain details of the incidents from the requestor would thus not preserve the individual's common-law right of privacy. Thus, the city must withhold the submitted information in its entirety pursuant to the common-law privacy principles incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that the documents demonstrate that the requestor may have a special right of access to information regarding the named individual pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. Therefore, to the extent the requestor has a special right of access to the submitted information, it may not be withheld from her under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.<sup>1</sup> However, to the extent the requestor does not have a special right of access, the submitted information must be withheld in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline,

---

<sup>1</sup>See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.229(c) (individual who has been adjudicated incompetent to manage own personal affairs or for whom attorney ad litem has been appointed may consent to release of information under this section only by written authorization of designated legal guardian or attorney ad litem.); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when person asks governmental body for information concerning himself or herself).


toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Heather Pendleton Ross  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

HPR/mcf

Ref: ID# 286412

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tarae Haggerty  
6504 Prosper  
Dallas, Texas 75209  
(w/o enclosures)