



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 1, 2016

Mr. Ryan S. Sullivan  
Public Information Officer  
Harris County Sheriff's Office  
1200 Baker Street, 2nd Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002-1206

OR2016-26595

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

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# 636724 (HCSO File No. 14SO6001264).

The Harris County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for a specified incident report. 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. 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.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to 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 himself). Additionally, the submitted information reveals the requestor is the spouse of the individual whose privacy interests are at issue. Thus, the requestor may be the authorized representative of that individual, and may have a right of access to information pertaining to her spouse that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, then the sheriff's office may not withhold any portion of the marked information from this requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. If the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, the sheriff's office 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, none of the remaining information may 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 personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects privacy interests. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold motor vehicle record information relating to the requestor under section 552.130. Furthermore, as noted above, the requestor may be her spouse's authorized representative, and may have a right of access to information

---

<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).

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

pertaining solely to him that would otherwise be confidential. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the requestor is acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the sheriff's office may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130. However, if the requestor is not acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, if the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the remaining information.<sup>3</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/som

Ref: ID# 636724

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</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 sheriff's office receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the sheriff's office must again seek a decision from this office.