



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 6, 2019

Ms. Delietrice Henry
Open Records Assistant
City of Plano
P.O. Box 860358
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2019-34345

Dear Ms. Henry:

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# 800257 (ORR# P004152-092519).

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual and a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. This office has also found the identities of

¹ We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

² 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.

victims of sexual abuse are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). The Third 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 also note information belonging to an individual who has been de-identified may not be withheld under common-law privacy as the de-identified individual's privacy interests are protected. We note the requestor is the authorized representative of the named individual and has a right of access to otherwise private information pertaining to the named individual pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, with the exception of the named individual's date of birth, the city must withhold the dates of birth of identifiable public citizens and the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides 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 is excepted from

public release.³ Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the named individual's date of birth, the city must withhold the dates of birth of identifiable public citizens and the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/rm

Ref: ID# 800257

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

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

⁴ We note the remaining information includes social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a government 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).