



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 4, 2020

Ms. Stephanie Berry
Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney Street
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2020-06746

Dear Ms. Berry:

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# 814681 (Ref. No. R001002-121119).

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for all records involving a named individual and two specified addresses. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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. This section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working

papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find Exhibit B was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police department (the "department"). *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. You do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code apply only to an emergency 9-1-1 district established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These statutes make confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a service supplier. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000. You state the city is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318. You further state the originating addresses and telephone numbers in Exhibit C consist of the originating addresses and telephone numbers of 9-1-1 callers provided by a service supplier. Thus, the city must withhold the originating addresses and telephone numbers in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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 common-law right to privacy protects the identifying information of a complainant in certain situations based on the facts of the case. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982) (concluding common-law privacy protects identifying information of victim of serious sexual offense). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

This office has also 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) (personal financial information includes choice of a particular insurance carrier), 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). 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.).

Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information in Exhibit C meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we note some of the information at issue pertains to an individual who is de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing to an identifiable individual and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must: (1) withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code; (2) withhold the originating addresses and telephone numbers in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code; (3) withhold the information we have marked and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (4) withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (5) release the remaining information.³

² 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).

³ 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).

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 black ink, appearing to read "Tim Neal", written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/rm

Ref: ID# 814681

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)