



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 6, 2020

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Council for the City of Mansfield
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2020-12908

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 826638 (ORR Nos. 0092-2020, 0093-2020, 0094-2020, 0095-2020, 0096-2020, 0097-2020, 0098-2020, 0099-2020).

The City of Mansfield (the "city"), which you represent, received eight requests from the same requestor for specified investigations.¹ You state the city will redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code, motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections

¹ You state the city sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the city received the required deposit on February 18, 2020. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

² Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses

552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.1085, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state some of the information you have submitted is not responsive to the requests because it does not pertain to the requested investigations. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the requests, and the city is not required to release such information in response to these requests.

Next, you state some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for a ruling, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-30222 (2019). In that ruling, we determined (1) as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information, and the **Error! Reference source not found.** need not release it; (2) the **Error! Reference source not found.** must release the previously released documents we marked pursuant to section 552.007 of the Government Code; and (3) with the exception of basic information, which the **Error! Reference source not found.** must release, the **Error! Reference source not found.** may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. You state the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed. Thus, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-30222 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the information at issue is not identical, we will address your submitted arguments.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the submitted information pertains to criminal investigations that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this

not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic “front-page” information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.³

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, 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, *writ ref’d n.r.e.*); *see also Justice v. Belo Broad. Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing to a living individual and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion 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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure to this information or the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455. 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 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491. After review of the remaining information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates a living 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 552.152 of the Government Code provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. You generally raise section 552.152 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the release of the remaining information would subject an employee or officer to a substantial risk of physical harm. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-30222 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 826638

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)