February 15, 2018

Ms. Dawn Brackett
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, P.L.L.C.
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

Dear Ms. Brackett:

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# 696211 (ORR ID# D112717VD).

The City of Denison (the “city”), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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. Upon review, we find the submitted video recordings contain motor vehicle record information. You state the city lacks the technological capability to redact the confidential information in the video recordings. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted video recordings in their entireties under section 552.130 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983).

The city asserts the date of birth in the remaining information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law
privacy. Section 552.101 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. *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.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted video recordings in their entireties under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

You ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office. See Gov’t Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). After due consideration, we have decided to grant your request on this matter. Therefore, this letter ruling authorizes the city to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is a personal right that lapses at an individual’s death. 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 Nos. 620 (1993), 272 (1981), 192 (1978). Therefore, this previous determination authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of living individuals. This previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth belonging to deceased individuals. We also note a person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to information that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the person’s privacy interests. See Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth requested by a person or the authorized representative of a person whose date of birth is at issue. Furthermore, information filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. See Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17); *Star-Telegram, Inc. V. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Accordingly, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth contained in court-filed documents. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the city need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of
information. See ORD 673 at 7-8 (listing elements of second type of previous determination under Gov't Code § 552.301(a)).

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,

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division
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