



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 27, 2020

Ms. Heather Silver
Assistant city Attorney
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar 6th Floor 6W
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2020-06403

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 813944.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the investigation file pertaining to a deceased individual. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections. 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek

¹ We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301(e) of the Government Code in providing some of the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nonetheless, we note sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code and the interests of a third party can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider your arguments. *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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

to withhold some of this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, no portion of the court-filed documents may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will address its applicability to the court-filed document subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Additionally, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a governmental body has custody of information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld.

You state, and provide documentation showing, the Dallas County Attorney’s Office (the “county attorney’s office”) has advised the submitted information relates to a pending prosecution, and release of that information would interfere with the prosecution of the case. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the county attorney’s office.³

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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked in the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by this state or another state or country. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


In summary, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the county attorney's office. The city must withhold the information we marked in the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 <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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ashley Crutchfield".

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/gw

Ref: ID# 813944

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)