



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 5, 2020

Mr. Matthew L. Wade
Counsel for the City of Snyder
The Underwood Law Firm
P.O. Box 16197
Lubbock, Texas 79490

OR2020-03371

Dear Mr. Wade:

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# 810065.

The City of Snyder (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the report related to a specified incident.¹ The city states it is releasing some of the requested information. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception the city claims 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.

¹ The city states it 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).

² The city also raises section 552.108 of the Government Code in its brief to this office. However, the city informs us it wishes to withdraw its claim under this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. Accordingly, we do not address its applicability to the submitted information.

Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd., 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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 Third 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.). Thus, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, to which the requestor has a right of access pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is 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 herself).

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. *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.

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

³ 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, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Claire" being the most prominent.

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 810065

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)