



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 25, 2017

Mr. Thomas A. Gwosdz  
City Attorney  
City of Victoria  
P.O. Box 1758  
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2017-21903

Dear Mr. Gwosdz:

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# 677136.

The City of Victoria (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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 statute, such as section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), emergency medical services (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by EMS personnel. Thus, except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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.). However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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 (1977))); 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, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Thus, the city must withhold all living public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>2</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

---

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

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

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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

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 (5th Cir. 1985)). However, 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. Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on constitutional privacy grounds. 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). The United States Supreme Court, however, 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). You state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the next of kin of the deceased individuals of the request for information and of the right to submit comments to this office. As of the date of this decision, we have not received any correspondence from the deceased individuals' next of kin. Thus, we have no basis for determining the families' privacy interests in the information at issue. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

In summary, except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in

---

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

conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>5</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,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/tdw

Ref: ID# 677136

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>5</sup>We note the remaining information contains a social security number. 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 under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).