



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 26, 2016

Ms. Charla Thomas
Deputy City Attorney
City of Temple
2 North Main, Suite 308
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2016-19378

Dear Ms. Thomas:

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# 624116.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual during a specified time period and information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the requested information is 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.

Initially, 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(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). In this instance, you state the city received the request for information on June 7, 2016. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was June 21, 2016. However, the envelope in which you requested a decision was meter-marked June 22, 2016. *See id.* § 552.308 (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). Although the city seeks to withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interest and may be waived. *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 in general), 663 at 5 (1999). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, the city also claims the submitted information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code. We note some of the submitted information may be subject to sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Because sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 make information confidential, they can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, and we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to 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 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. 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 that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

The present request, in part, seeks all information pertaining to a named individual. This portion of the request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual and implicates the named individual's right to privacy. However, we find the part of the request that seeks information pertaining to a specified incident does not implicate the named individual's privacy interests. You have submitted incident report number 16001358, which is responsive to this part of the request. Because incident report number 16001358 was specifically requested, it may not be withheld as part of a criminal history compilation. However, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records other than report number 16001358 depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the city has also submitted information that does not depict the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or a criminal defendant. This information does not constitute a criminal history compilation protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, the information at issue must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the incident from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual's common-law right of privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, the city must withhold report number 16001358 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 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. 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.² *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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or

²Section 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).

embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked and indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136; *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the credit card number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records other than report number 16001358 depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold report number 16001358 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.³

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.

³We note the remaining information contains social security numbers. 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 under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Ramirez". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/akg

Ref: ID# 624116

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)