



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 14, 2019

Mr. Arthur Provenghi
Legal Counsel
Housing Authority of the City of El Paso
P.O. Box 9895
El Paso, Texas 79995-2895

OR2019-12919

Dear Mr. Provenghi:

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# 765356.

The Housing Authority of the City of El Paso (the "authority") received a request for the applications for residents at two specified addresses. 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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.).

Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Further, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See id.* (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy).

In Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983), this office determined financial information submitted by applicants for federally-funded housing rehabilitation loans and grants was “information deemed confidential” by a common-law right of privacy. The financial information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 373 included sources of income, salary, mortgage payments, assets, medical and utility bills, social security and veterans benefits, retirement and state assistance benefits, and credit history. Additionally, in Open Records Decision No. 523 (1989), we held the credit reports, financial statements, and financial information included in loan files of individual veterans participating in the Veterans Land Program were excepted from disclosure by the common-law right of privacy. Similarly, we thus conclude financial information relating to an applicant for housing assistance satisfies the first requirement of common-law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities.

The second requirement of the common-law privacy test requires the information not be of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 668. While the public generally has some interest in knowing whether public funds expended for housing assistance are being given to qualified applicants, we believe ordinarily this interest will not be sufficient to justify the invasion of the applicant’s privacy that would result from disclosure of information concerning his or her financial status. *See* ORD 373 (although any record maintained by governmental body is arguably of legitimate public interest, if only relation of individual to governmental body is as applicant for housing rehabilitation grant, second requirement of common-law privacy test not met). In particular cases, a requestor may demonstrate the existence of a public interest that will overcome the second requirement of the common-law privacy test. However, whether there is a public interest in this information sufficient to justify its disclosure must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORDs 523, 373.

Open Records Decision Nos. 373 and 523 draw a distinction between the confidential “background financial information furnished to a public body about an individual” and “the basic facts regarding a particular financial transaction between the individual and the public

body.” Open Records Decision Nos. 523, 385 (1983). Subsequent decisions of this office analyze questions about the confidentiality of background financial information consistently with Open Records Decision No. 373. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545, 523, 481 (individual financial information concerning applicant for public employment is closed), 480 (names of students receiving loans and amounts received from Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation are public); *see also* Attorney General Opinions H-1070 (1977), H-15 (1973) (laws requiring financial disclosure by public officials and candidates for office do not invade their privacy rights). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 602 at 5 (1992) (records related to salaries of those employees for whom the city pays a portion are subject to the Act). We note, however, this office has concluded the names and present addresses of current or former residents of a public housing development are not protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 318 (1982). Likewise, the amounts paid by a housing authority on behalf of eligible tenants are not protected from disclosure under privacy interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 268 (1981); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10, 545, 489 (1987), 480. Whether the public has a legitimate interest in an individual’s sources of income must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373 at 4; *see also* ORDs 600, 545.

Upon review, we conclude the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the authority must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, the authority must withhold all public citizens dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The authority must release the remaining information.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/>

¹We note the remaining 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. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

[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 that reads "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "L".

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/mo

Ref: ID# 765356

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)