



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 8, 2012

Ms. Julie Pandya Doshier
Counsel for City of Farmers Branch
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Lincoln Plaza
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2012-17935

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 471840 (Farmers Branch Reference No. 57343).

The City of Farmers Branch (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 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 incorporates the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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

¹We note 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 an attorney general decision under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

(Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. 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. Generally, only highly intimate or embarrassing information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where the requestor knows the identity of the individual at issue and the nature of certain incidents, the information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy.

In this instance, you state the requestor has indicated to you that he knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of the information in the submitted report. Therefore, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the incident from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual's common-law right of privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, the city must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.²

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,



Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/eb

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 471840

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)