



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

January 21, 2010

Ms. LeAnn M. Quinn, TRMC  
City Secretary  
City of Cedar Park  
600 North Bell Boulevard  
Cedar Park, Texas 78613

OR2010-00965

Dear Ms. Quinn:

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# 367662 (Reference No. 10-041).

The City of Cedar Park (the "city") received a request for all information involving a specified address from 1998 through 2008, and for two specified incident reports involving a named individual.<sup>1</sup> You state you will release some information to the requestor. You also state you will redact social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim the remaining responsive information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that the submitted information includes the requestor's fingerprints. Section 560.003 of the Government Code provides that "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." Gov't Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) ("biometric identifier" means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). Section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, however, that "[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us that the requestor contacted the city to clarify his request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

<sup>2</sup>We note that 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.

person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]” *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). Thus, the fingerprints we have marked must be released to this requestor pursuant to section 560.002(1)(A). *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself).

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. This exception encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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 type 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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990). However, we note an individual’s name, home address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of a person’s home address and telephone number is not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers do not qualify as “intimate aspects of human affairs”). Upon review, we find the information we have marked in Exhibit B constitutes personal financial information. Further, we find there is not a legitimate public interest in the release of this information. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit B under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, we conclude no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. The constitutional right to privacy protects two types of interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy” recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *Id.* The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.* The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual’s privacy interests against the public’s need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The

scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common-law right to privacy; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

In Open Records Decision No. 430 (1985), our office determined that a list of inmate visitors is protected by constitutional privacy because people have a First Amendment right to correspond with inmates, and that right would be threatened if their names were released. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 428 (1985), 185 (1978) (public's right to obtain an inmate's correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the First Amendment right of the inmate's correspondents to maintain communication with inmate free of the threat of public exposure). We have marked inmate visitor information in Exhibit B that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

You claim Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the information in Exhibit C relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Accordingly, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is generally applicable to the information in Exhibit C.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic "front-page" information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-87; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which you state you will release, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Next, you assert that some of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). Therefore, the city

must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the marked fingerprints must be released to this requestor pursuant to section 560.002(1)(A) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and constitutional privacy. Except for basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.<sup>4</sup>

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/eeg

---

<sup>3</sup>We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including Texas license plate numbers and Texas driver's license numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has a special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). Because such information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

Ref: ID# 367662

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)