



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 2, 2017

Mr. Stephen D. Gates  
First Assistant City Attorney  
City of Midland  
P.O. Box 1152  
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2017-02371

Dear Mr. Gates:

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# 644324 (Midland ID# M019385-111016).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for all records pertaining to a named individual and a specified address during a specified time period, including a specified incident. You state the city has released some information to the requestor, including basic information.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(c) (basic information about an arrest, arrested person, or crime cannot be withheld under section 552.108). 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 information in Exhibit B was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-24597 (2016). In that ruling, we determined with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold incident report #161018030 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. We have no indication there has been any

---

<sup>1</sup>We note basic information includes an arrestee's social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, the city may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-24597 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the information in the current request is not encompassed by the prior ruling, we will consider any applicable exceptions to disclosure of this information.

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.” 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 information in Exhibit B relates to an ongoing investigation, and release of that information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue in Exhibit B 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 (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). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue in Exhibit B. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information at issue in Exhibit B.

You seek to withhold portions of Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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 of the Government Code 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. This office has also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision

---

<sup>2</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

No. 455 (1987). 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> *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 information in Exhibit C satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information 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>4</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-24597 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the information at issue in Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

---

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

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,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 644324

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)