



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 14, 2020

Ms. Marie N. Johnson
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer, Fort & McDonald, PLLC
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2020-10907

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 819202 (ORR ID: D121819RD).

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation involving a named individual.¹ You state the city has released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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, 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

¹ You state the city sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. You inform us the requestor modified her request in response to the cost estimates. *See id.* § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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 submitted information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We understand you to contend the city does not have the technological capability to redact information from the audio recording at issue. However, because the city had the ability to copy the submitted audio recording for our review, we believe the city has the capability to produce a copy of only the non-confidential portions of the audio recording. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of 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 marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated and 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.

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

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).

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,

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/gw

Ref: ID# 819202

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)