



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 1, 2017

Ms. Teresa L. Presley
Records Manager
City of Frisco
7200 Stonebrook Parkway
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2017-24949

Dear Ms. Presley:

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# 688131 (Ref. No. P022093-092917).

The City of Frisco (the "city") received a request for all incident reports involving a specified address, a named individual, and/or the requestor's client. 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 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. 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.

Upon review of the request and the submitted information, we find the requestor is seeking reports involving her client and the other named individual. We note you have submitted information which lists the requestor's client as an involved party. Thus, this request does not implicate the named individual's right to privacy, and the city may not withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy as a compilation of any individual's criminal history. However, we will consider your remaining argument against release of the information at issue.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her client's date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code; thus, this information may not be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, with the exception of the requestor's client's date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the remaining information to this requestor.¹

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

¹We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

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, appearing to read "Tim Neal". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Tim" being more prominent than the last name "Neal".

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/tdw

Ref: ID# 688131

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)