



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 3, 2017

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

OR2017-09448

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# 662596 (Ref. No. 85230).

The City of Glenn Heights (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all call reports related to a specified address. You state the city released some information. 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)(2) 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 . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that 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 the information you have marked pertains to a criminal investigation that did not result in

conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations, we find the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 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 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked and we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked and we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.<sup>2</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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

<sup>2</sup>We note the information being released contains the requestor’s date of birth, which the requestor has a right of access to under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a). If the city receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a decision from this office.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Ramirez". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping flourish at the end of the name.

Britni Ramirez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BR/som

Ref: ID# 662596

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)