



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 13, 2016

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

OR2016-21407A

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

Our office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-21407 (2016) on September 22, 2016. We have determined the prior ruling should be corrected. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.306, .352. Accordingly, we hereby withdraw the prior ruling. This decision is substituted for Open Records Letter No. 2016-21407 and serves as the correct ruling. *See generally id.* § 552.011 (providing Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Act). This ruling was assigned ID# 636960.

The McKinney Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received six requests for information related to a specified incident as well as other information pertaining to a specified address. You state the department will release some information. You claim the submitted 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 note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present requests for information because it was created after the present requests for information were received. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the requests, and the department need not release such information, which we have marked, in response to these requests.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide documentation showing, Exhibits B and C relate to a pending criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of Exhibits B and C 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibits B and C.

However, we note section 552.108 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; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold Exhibits B and C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

You claim portions of Exhibit D are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 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 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). Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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.² *Tex. 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, however, that the date of birth, as well as the remaining information that meets the standard articulated

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider the additional argument against disclosure of this information.

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).

in *Industrial Foundation*, in Exhibit D belong to a deceased individual. Because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. Accordingly, the information at issue pertaining to the deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. See *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Further, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information in Exhibit D is highly intimate or embarrassing information of a living individual that is not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of Exhibit D under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold Exhibits B and C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/som

Ref: ID# 636960

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 5 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)