



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 15, 2019

Ms. Charla Thomas  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Temple  
2 North Main Street, Suite 308  
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2019-28936

Dear Ms. Thomas:

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# 791399.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for records pertaining to specified types of incidents involving the requestor and a named individual during a stated period of time. 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the present request for information because it does not involve the types of incidents specified in the present request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to the present request.<sup>2</sup>

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. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which

---

<sup>1</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.

<sup>2</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

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. 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) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

You assert the present request requires the city to compile law enforcement records concerning the individual named in the request. However, we note the requestor is involved in the submitted responsive information. Thus, the submitted responsive information does not implicate the privacy interests of the other individual named in the request and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy as a compilation of criminal history.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth and her minor child's date of birth and this information may not be withheld from the requestor on the basis of common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, the city must withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.<sup>3</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the city: (1) must withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (3) must release the remaining responsive information to this requestor.<sup>4</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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Blake Brennan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BBX/rm

Ref: ID# 791399

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup> We note the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released in this instance. *See* Fam. Code § 261.201(k); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. We also note the remaining responsive information includes a social security number to which the requestor does not have a right of access. 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).