



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 21, 2016

Ms. Julie Pandya Doshier  
Counsel for City of Highland Village  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
1800 Ross Tower  
500 North Akard  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2016-28197

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 638783 (Ref. No. 80251-2016-220).

The City of Highland Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified report. You state you will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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.

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information 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 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the information you have marked would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

*v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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.<sup>3</sup> *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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the date of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law physical safety exception. The Texas Supreme Court has recognized, for the first time, a common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure. *Tex. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112, 118 (Tex. 2011). Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, “information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm. *Id.* In applying this standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>3</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>4</sup>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 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion. See Gov’t Code §552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Please note the city may withhold public citizens’ dates of birth without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-21546 (2016).

harm, but further cautioned, “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119. In applying this standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119. You state the city’s police department “believes that release of the name, address, and telephone number of the criminal suspect . . . would create a substantial threat of physical harm to the suspect and his family.” However, we find you have not demonstrated disclosure of the remaining information at issue would create substantial threat of physical harm to these individuals. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the date of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>5</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,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MHT/akg

---

<sup>5</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) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

Ref: ID# 638783

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)