



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 21, 2017

Ms. Sally Ortiz  
Open Records Assistant  
City of Plano  
P.O. Box 860358  
Plano, Texas 75086

OR2017-03841

Dear Ms. Ortiz:

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# 646371.

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to two specified incidents and all reports pertaining to a named individual and a specified location during a specified time period. 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.

Initially, we note you have only submitted one incident report to this office for our review. We assume, to the extent any remaining requested information existed on the date the city received the request, the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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 (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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 found a compilation of an individual's criminal history 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 that 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. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

You argue the present request, in part, seeks all reports pertaining to a named individual and requires the city to compile the named individual's criminal history. However, we note the submitted information does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Therefore, this information does not consist of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis.

Some of the submitted information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision 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>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 some of the information at issue satisfies the

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the date of birth you marked and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

You ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without seeking a ruling from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). We note our office issued a previous determination permitting the city's police department to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy in Open Records Letter No. 2017-00118 (2017).

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,



Sidney M. Pounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SMP/sdk

Ref: ID# 646371

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)