



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 2, 2016

Ms. Susan Camp-Lee  
Counsel for the City of Round Rock  
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.  
309 East Main Street  
Round Rock, Texas 78664

OR2016-02551

Dear Ms. Camp-Lee:

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# 596420.

The Round Rock Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for records pertaining to specified addresses and named individuals during a specified period of time. You state you will redact some information pursuant to sections 552.130(c), 552.136(c), and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request, in part, requires the department to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individuals. We find this request for unspecified law enforcement records implicates the named individuals' rights to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the department maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the department must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>2</sup> However, we note you have submitted information in which the named individuals are not depicted as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants. This information does not implicate the privacy interests of the individuals and may not be withheld as a compilation of criminal history.

However, some of this information is otherwise subject to common-law privacy. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. 540 S.W.2d at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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).

Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus.*

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

*Found.*, 540 S.W. 2d at 682. 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 disclosure.<sup>3</sup> *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. Upon review, we find most of the information you and we marked satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note a portion of the information you marked pertains to an individual who is not identified. Thus, the information does not implicate an individual's privacy interest. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the department must withhold the information you and we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>4</sup>

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* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the department maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the department must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the department must withhold the information you and we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must also withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 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).

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>5</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987).

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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Taylor".

Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MT/dls

Ref: ID# 596420

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)