



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 16, 2016

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez  
Counsel for City of McKinney  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2016-18448

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 623153 (CoM ORR# P000864-060116).

The McKinney Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for three specified incident reports. We note you have released some information to the requestor. We understand you have redacted information you determined to be subject to section 552.130(a) of the Government Code without requesting a decision from this office, as permitted by section 552.130(c) of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.130(d), the requestor has asked this office to review the redacted information and render a decision as to whether this information is excepted from disclosure. Additionally, you claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* 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). Further, 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>1</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. However, we note the submitted information includes the requestor's date of birth. The requestor has a right of access to this information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("a person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is 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 herself).

Upon review, we find portions of the information at issue satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold the information you have marked and the dates of birth of public citizens, other than the requestor, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We previously noted, pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, the department has redacted information it determined to be subject to section 552.130(a) of the Government Code without requesting a decision from this office. As the information at issue has been provided to this office, we will address the requestor's appeal seeking a ruling regarding whether the information you redacted under section 552.130 is so excepted. 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

---

<sup>1</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).

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(a). Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue consists of motor vehicle record information. Consequently, the department may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information you have marked and the dates of birth of public citizens, other than the requestor, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.<sup>2</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.

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,



Gerald A. Arismendez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

GAA/dls

Ref: ID# 623153

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.