



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 2, 2017

Mr. Thomas Royce Hansen  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2017-25066

Dear Mr. Hansen:

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# 683083 (ORR# W064683).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for 9-1-1 calls for a specified address during a specified time period. You state you will release some information. We understand you will withhold the originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller pursuant to the previous determination issued to the city in Open Records Letter No. 2011-15641 (2011).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2011-15641 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code, an originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller furnished to the city by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>2</sup>Although you do not raise section 552.130 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand the city to assert this exception based on your markings.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee’s decisions regarding voluntary benefit programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy.) Additionally, 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. 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. *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, we note the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the general details of a crime. *See generally Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity” (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (5th Cir. 1994))); *Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d at 186-87 (public has legitimate interest in details of crime and police efforts to combat crime in community). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of an individual that is of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.<sup>3</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,



Emily Buchanan  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

EB/som

Ref: ID# 683083

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the submitted 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).