



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 16, 2017

Ms. Marie N. Rovira  
Counsel for the City of Denison  
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, P.L.L.C.  
6351 Preston Road, Suite 350  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2017-05444

Dear Ms. Rovira:

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# 649104.

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the death of a named individual. You state the city has released some information to the requestor, including the CR-3 accident report. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.1085 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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 information made confidential by other statutes, such as chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). You indicate the city is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. Upon review, we find the city

has not established any of the submitted information consists of the originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller that was furnished by a service supplier. Accordingly, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information is confidential under section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, and may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. 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>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. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985)). However,

---

<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).

because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the constitutional right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). However, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004). The family of the deceased individual at issue asserts a privacy interest in the information that relates to their deceased relative. A representative of the decedent's family has submitted correspondence to this office stating the decedent's family objects to disclosure of the information at issue. Upon review, we find the family's privacy interest in the information we have indicated outweighs the public's interest in the disclosure of this information. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.<sup>2</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue either does not fall within the zones of privacy or implicate an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy, or the public interest in the information at issue outweighs any remaining privacy interests.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information in the remaining photographs as well as any discernible audible or visible motor vehicle record information in the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the information we have indicated under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information in the remaining photographs as well as any discernible audible or visible motor vehicle record information in the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

---

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

<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).

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,



Ian Lancaster  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

IML/sb

Ref: ID# 649104

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)