



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 11, 2011

Mr. Robert E. Hager
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Lincoln Plaza
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2011-14756

Dear Mr. Hager:

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# 432685 (File Reference # 50584).

The Rowlett Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for the audio recordings of statements and the crime scene photographs pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 section encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S.589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fadlo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987). The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects

of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See 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.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). However, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat’l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 124 S. Ct. 1570 (2004). Thus, because the submitted photographs relate to a deceased individual, they may not be withheld from disclosure based on his privacy interests.

In this instance, you indicate that you have attempted to notify the deceased individual’s family members of the request and of their right to assert a privacy interest in the submitted photographs of the deceased.¹ As of the date of this decision, we have not received correspondence from the family members of the deceased. Thus, we have no basis for determining that those family members have any privacy interest in the submitted photographs of the deceased. Therefore, the photographs at issue may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.101 also 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 type of information considered intimate or 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 that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). However, the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the details of a crime. *See Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity” (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). Determinations under common-law privacy must be made on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 373 at 4 (1983); *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685 (whether matter is of legitimate interest to public can be considered only in context of each particular case). Further, as noted above, privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, and, therefore, may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d 489 at 491; ORD 272 at 1.

¹See Gov’t Code § 552.304 (any person may submit written comments stating why information at issue in request for attorney general decision should or should not be released).

You assert the submitted photographs of the deceased are subject to common-law privacy. Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the photographs at issue are subject to common-law privacy, and the department may not withhold this information under section 552.101 on that basis. However, we note the information we have indicated in one of the submitted recordings is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have indicated in one of the submitted recordings pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the

governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the department anticipates litigation pertaining to the specified incident because the requestor has stated publically to the press on numerous occasions that the department’s failure to enforce a protective order resulted in the incident at issue. However, you have not informed us the requestor has actually threatened litigation or otherwise taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); ORD 331. Thus, we find you have not established the department reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code to the remaining information, and it may not be withheld under that exception.

We note some of the submitted photographs contain motor vehicle record information pertaining to the deceased individual and a living individual. Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.³ *See* Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 4 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov’t Code § 552.130). We note section 552.130 protects privacy which, as previously noted, is a personal right that lapses at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d 489 at 491; ORD 272 at 1. Therefore, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 only if a living individual owns an interest in the vehicle depicted in the submitted photographs. If no living individual owns an interest in this vehicle, then the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.130 and must be released. The department must withhold the remaining motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

²In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have indicated in one of the submitted recordings pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If a living individual owns an interest in the vehicle depicted in the submitted photographs, the department must withhold the information we have marked in the submitted photographs. The department must withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.⁴

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, 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 432685

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note some of the information being released contains confidential information to which the requestor has a right of access. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual or authorized representative asks governmental body to provide information concerning that individual). Thus, if the department receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a decision from this office.