



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 25, 2019

Mr. James Kopp  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
315 South Santa Rosa, 6th Floor  
San Antonio, Texas 78207

OR2019-17289

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 775188 (COSA File No. W259060).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for all records pertaining to three named individuals during a specified time period.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>We note the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Thus, we will address the applicability of this exception to the submitted information, notwithstanding the city's violation of section 552.301 in requesting this decision.

<sup>3</sup>We assume the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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. 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. U.S. 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). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individuals. We find this request for unspecified law enforcement records implicates the named individuals’ right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not part of a compilation of the individual’s criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note you have submitted information in which none of the named individuals are depicted as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not implicate the privacy interests of the individuals and may not be withheld as a compilation of criminal history. Accordingly, we will address your argument against disclosure of this information.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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 conclude the information you marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you marked and all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records depicting any of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information you marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/jxd

Ref: ID# 775188

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)