



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 6, 2017

Mr. Jonathan T. Koury  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Bryan  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2017-04755

Dear Mr. Koury:

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# 647828.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual and the requestor over a specified time period. 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</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, 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683.

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). Moreover, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, however, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See* Gov't Code § 411.081(b). We also note that records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person does not implicate the privacy interest of the individual and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Upon review, we find the present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual other than the requestor. We find this part of the request generally implicates the other named individual's right to privacy. However, we note the requestor also seeks information involving herself. This part of the request seeks specified records involving the requestor and does not implicate the other named individual's right to privacy. Further, the requestor has a special right of access to her own information that would ordinarily be withheld to protect her privacy interests. *See id.* § 552.023(a)-(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person or person's representative to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential under privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, information relating to the requestor may not be withheld from her as a compilation of criminal history under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We also note the city has submitted driving record information, active warrant information, and information that does not list the other named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not consist of a compilation of the other named individual's criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information as a criminal history compilation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See*

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state Exhibit B relates to criminal cases that did not result in convictions or deferred adjudications because the cases either were closed or suspended due to non-cooperation by the victim or lack of evidence. Based on your representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to Exhibit B.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

As discussed above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, 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>2</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 remaining information, which 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.

---

<sup>2</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).

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>3</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>4</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/sdk

---

<sup>3</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).

<sup>4</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 city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 647828

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)