April 15, 2016

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 606176 (ORR# W111124).

The City of San Antonio (the “city”) received a request for use of force forms submitted by a named officer of the city’s police department during a specified time period. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in Industrial Foundation. Id. at 683. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual’s criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Cf. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of
the Press, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

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.\(^1\) 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. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in Industrial Foundation. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. See Gov’t Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). After due consideration, we have decided to grant your request on this matter. Therefore, this letter ruling authorizes the city to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is a personal right that lapses at an individual’s death. See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc., 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex.

\(^1\)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).
App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 272 (1981), 192 (1978). Therefore, this previous determination authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of living individuals. This previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth belonging to deceased individuals. We also note a person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to information that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the person’s privacy interests. See Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth requested by a person or the authorized representative of a person whose date of birth is at issue. Furthermore, information filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. See Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17); Star-Telegram v. Walker, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Accordingly, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth contained in court-filed documents. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the city need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information. See ORD 673 at 7-8 (listing elements of second type of previous determination under Gov’t Code § 552.301(a)).

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref:  ID# 606176

Enc.  Submitted documents

C:  Requestor
   (w/o enclosures)