



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 4, 2016

Ms. Alexis G. Allen  
Counsel for the City of Lancaster  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, LLP  
1800 Ross Tower  
500 North Akard Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2016-02717

Dear Ms. Allen:

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# 596897 (Lancaster Ref. No. 74342).

The Lancaster Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for three specified incident reports involving two named individuals. You state you will redact motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted 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 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. Section 552.101 encompasses 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

---

<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).

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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not private as criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. In addition, we note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information).

You contend the present request requires the department to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individuals. However, we note the request seeks specific reports pertaining to the individuals. This request does not seek a compilation of either individual's criminal history and does not implicate the named individuals' common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information as a criminal history compilation under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides that "an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record." *Transp. Code* § 730.004. "Personal information" includes a person's name, address, and driver identification number, but not the zip code. *Id.* § 730.003(6). The Department of Public Safety ("DPS") is an "agency" for purposes of chapter 730. *See id.* § 730.003(1) ("agency" is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records). You state a portion of the information at issue was obtained by the department from DPS. *See id.* § 730.007(a)(2)(A)(I) (personal information may be disclosed to government agency in carrying out its functions). An authorized recipient of personal information may not re-disclose the personal information and to do so is a misdemeanor offense. *Id.* § 730.013(a),(d). Accordingly, we find the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code.

As previously mentioned, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. This

office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, 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. 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>2</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. We note the requestor has a special right of access to her own information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has 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); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Upon review, we find the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, except for the requestor's, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy to the remaining information, and the department may not withhold it on that basis.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. The department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, except for the requestor's, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.<sup>3</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.

---

<sup>2</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>3</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; ORD 481. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a ruling from this office.

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 'Thana Hussaini', with a horizontal line drawn through it.

Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 596897

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)