



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 5, 2019

Ms. Susan Camp-Lee  
Counsel for the City of Round Rock  
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.  
309 East Main Street  
Round Rock, Texas 78664-5246

OR2019-09243

Dear Ms. Camp-Lee:

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# 758489.

The City of Round Rock (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for police records pertaining to two named individuals.<sup>1</sup> You state the city will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You state the city will release some information. 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the city did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 (b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Nevertheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. Thus, we will consider the claim of the city under that section.

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (1992) (employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Whether the public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373. The Third 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.).

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). Moreover, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person does not implicate the privacy interest of the individual and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the individuals named in the request, thus implicating the named individuals' rights to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note you have submitted a report that does not depict either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Thus, this information is not

part of a criminal history compilation protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. However, we find the information at issue contains information that satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold the information we marked and the public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city 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](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,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MHT/jxd

Ref: ID# 758489

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)