



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 5, 2016

Ms. Captoria Brown
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
City of Carrollton
1945 East Jackson Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2016-02891

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 597554 (City ID No. 6226).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for a specified incident report. You state you have released some information. 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 representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the city has submitted information which does not pertain to the specified incident report in the request. We have marked this information as not responsive. This ruling does not address the public availability of nonresponsive information, and the city is not required to release nonresponsive information in response to this request.²

¹We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Next, we must address the city's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Gov't Code § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state, and submit documentation showing, the city received the request for information on November 11, 2015. We understand the city was closed for business on November 26, 2015 and November 27, 2015. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or days the governmental body is closed for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Additionally, you do not indicate the city was closed for business between November 11, 2015, and November 25, 2015. Accordingly, the city's fifteen-business-day deadline was December 4, 2015. The envelope in which you submitted the information required by section 552.301(e) was meter-marked December 9, 2015. *See id.* § 552.302 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail.) Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third-party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). You claim section 552.108 of the Government Code for portions of the responsive information. However, section 552.108 is discretionary in nature. It serves to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as a result, it does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information. *See Simmons*, 166 S.W.3d at 350 (section 552.108 is not compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we note section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason

to overcome the presumption of openness. Therefore, we will address the applicability of this section to the responsive information.

We understand you to raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 71.004 of the Family Code. 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 information protected by other statutes. Section 71.004 of the Family Code defines the term “family violence.” See Fam. Code § 71.004. You generally assert this section make the submitted information confidential. However, as noted, this section only provides the definition of a certain term and does make any information confidential. Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making certain information confidential or stating that information shall not be released to the public). Therefore, none of the information at issue is confidential under section 71.004 of the Family Code. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 71.004 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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. 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. *Id.* 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.³ *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

³Section 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).

implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, except for the requestor's date of birth, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining responsive 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.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,



Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 597554

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.