



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 25, 2016

Ms. Victoria D. Honey
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-04562

Dear Ms. Honey:

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# 599900 (Fort Worth PIR No. W047726).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all information relating to a named individual and specified arrest. The city states it is releasing some of the requested information. The city states it has redacted information pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code and the previous determinations issued to the city in Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 (2011), 2011-15956 (2011), and 2013-22304 (2013).¹ The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of

¹Section 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* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 and 2011-15956 are previous determinations issued to the city authorizing the city to withhold the originating telephone numbers and addresses, respectively, of 9-1-1 callers furnished to the city by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code, without requesting a decision from this office. Open Records Letter No. 2013-22304 is a previous determination issued to the department authorizing the department to withhold FBI numbers under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law without requesting a ruling from this office.

the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims 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 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.

Upon review, we find the present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. Accordingly, we find the request implicates the named individual’s right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records, other than information pertaining to the specified arrest, depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note, however, the city has submitted a report which does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Additionally, the submitted information includes records of the specified arrest. This information does not implicate the privacy interests of the named individual. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy as a criminal history compilation. Accordingly, we will address the city’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city states the information it has indicated relates to a pending criminal case with the Tarrant County District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”). The city submitted an affidavit from the district attorney’s office objecting to the release of the information at issue. Upon

review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

Section 552.108, however, does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information the city has indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects the specific types of information the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. This office has also 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) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 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).

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.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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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).

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 the information the city has marked and we have marked satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information it has marked and we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The city states it has redacted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.⁴ We note some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.130. Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or 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. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records, other than information pertaining to the specified arrest, depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information the city has indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information it has marked and we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information at issue.

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

⁴We note 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).

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 'D. Wheelus', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 599900

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)