



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 18, 2017

Ms. Stacie S. White
Counsel for the City of Southlake
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2017-15962

Dear Ms. White:

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# 666641.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all police reports pertaining to four named individuals during a specified time period, all correspondence between two named individuals and city officials and staff, and all complaints made to the city by a named individual pertaining to two named individuals or a specified address during a specified time period. You inform us the city will release some information to the requestor. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You also state the city

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

will withhold certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim.

Initially, we note some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2017-10562 (2017). In that ruling, we determined the information at issue must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-10562 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the information in the instant request is not identical to the information ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2017-10562, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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. 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.

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

The present request, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning four named individuals. We find this request for unspecified law enforcement records implicates the named individuals' rights to privacy. Thus, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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. We note you have submitted information that does not list the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individuals' criminal histories, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

We note you have redacted dates of birth from the information at issue. You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city has been granted a previous determination to withhold such information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). Information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we are able to discern the nature of the information that has been redacted; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with the requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested"), .302. Thus, in the future, the city should refrain from redacting, without authorization, any information it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses 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. The Third 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 portions of the information at issue satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth 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 public concern. Thus, none of the


remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-10562 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. To the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting the named individuals as suspects, arrestees, or criminal defendants, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city 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,



Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/tdw

Ref: ID# 666641

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)