



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 12, 2017

Mr. Oscar G. Gabaldón, Jr.
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2017-28177

Dear Mr. Gabaldón:

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# 687518 (Case# 17-1026-8871).

The El Paso Police Department (the "department") 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.¹ 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note the

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy for the submitted information, you provide no arguments explaining how this doctrine is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this doctrine. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, 302.


public has a legitimate interest in knowing the general details of a crime. *See generally Lowe v. Hearst Commc'ns, 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 Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (public has legitimate interest in details of crime and police efforts to combat crime in community). 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. *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*. However, we note the requestor may be acting as the authorized representative of one of the individuals whose privacy interests are at issue; thus, the requestor may have a right of access to this individual's private information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person or person's representative to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential under privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Because we are unable to determine whether the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of one of the individuals whose privacy interests are at issue, we must rule conditionally. If the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of the individual at issue, then the sheriff's office may not withhold the information we have marked or the date of birth relating to this individual under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of the individual at issue, then the department must withhold the information we have marked and the date of birth relating to this individual under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. In either instance, the department must withhold the remaining public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Taylor", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/tdw

Ref: ID# 687518

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)