



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 20, 2017

Ms. Derenda Rush
Service Division
Amarillo Police Department
200 Southeast Third Avenue
Amarillo, Texas 79101-1514

OR2017-13672

Dear Ms. Rush:

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# 662528 (APD No. 17-706).

The Amarillo Police Department (the "department") received a request for information regarding a specified incident involving a named individual. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The department asserts the dates of birth in the submitted information are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy

¹Although you do not raise section 552.130 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on your markings.

pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). We note because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]” *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 *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I)); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, the department must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth pertaining to living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no writ). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. See, e.g., ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

You state the information you have marked, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution of crime. You state the release of the information at issue would provide knowledge of specialized tactical procedures that could endanger the lives and physical safety of department officers and public citizens. You further state release of the

information at issue would give criminals knowledge of the type of weapons and training department officers receive, placing them at an advantage against the officers. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the release of the information you marked would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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. However, section 552.130 is designed to protect the privacy of individuals, and the right to privacy expires at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; ORD 272 at 1. Thus, the department may not withhold the driver's license information pertaining to the deceased individual at issue under section 552.130. However, the department must withhold the remaining information it has marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth pertaining to living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code that pertains to living individuals. The department must release the remaining information.

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, 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/tdw

Ref: ID# 662528

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)