



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 14, 2016

Mr. Guillermo Trevino
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-20760

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 626428 (Fort Worth Reference No. W053021).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim 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 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). 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. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. The city argues the submitted information must

be withheld in its entirety on the basis of common-law privacy. However, the city has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the submitted information must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Thus, the city may not withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

As noted, 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. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 681-82. 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). Furthermore, this office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision No. 600* (1992). We note the requestor is one of the individuals whose privacy interests are at issue. *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). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his own information that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the requestor's information from him under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy. Upon review, the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked 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 is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 a personal

¹Section 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.² Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the submitted information contains motor vehicle record information. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. In this instance, it is not clear whether some of the information at issue belongs to the requestor. As such, the requestor may have a right of access to some of the information at issue. Thus, we must rule conditionally. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, to the extent the information we have marked belongs to the requestor, the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to his motor vehicle record information, and this information may not be withheld under section 552.130. To the extent the information we marked does not belong to the requestor, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information we marked does not belong to the requestor, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 626428

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)