



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 4, 2019

Mr. Peter G. Smith  
City Attorney  
City of Richardson  
P.O. Box 831078  
Richardson, Texas 75083-1078

OR2019-14743

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 768813 (ORR Nos. P000765 & P001333).

The Richardson Police Department (the "department") received two requests from different requestors for information related to a specified incident involving a named individual. The department states it will redact public citizens' dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2017-00069 (2017).<sup>1</sup> The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

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

---


<sup>1</sup>Open Records Letter No. 2017-00069 authorizes the department 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.

Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, the department informs us the requestor knows both the identity of the individual involved and the nature of the incident at issue. Therefore, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the incident from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, the department must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>2</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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/gw

Ref: ID# 768813

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department's remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.