



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 3, 2020

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

OR2020-15291

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# 834260 (ORR# D004795-021720, D005640-022420, D-006369-030320).

The Dallas Police Department (the “department”) received three requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified incident. The department claims 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 claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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 the release of the

¹ The department acknowledges, and we agree, it did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, because sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code and third-party interests can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301, we will consider whether the submitted information must be withheld on those grounds.

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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). The department has submitted correspondence from the Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objecting to the release of the information marked under section 552.108(a)(1) because it relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district 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 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990)*. 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 agree the information that the department has marked under common-law privacy satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the department must generally withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. *See Gov't Code § 552.130*. The department must generally withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device

³ As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

number for purposes of section 552.136. Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Thus, the department must generally withhold the insurance policy numbers it has marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

However, we note some of the information that the department seeks to withhold under common-law privacy and sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code pertains to a deceased individual. Because “the right of privacy is purely personal[,]” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]” *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 § 6521 (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”). Sections 552.130 and 552.136 are designed to protect the privacy of individuals. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information pertaining to the deceased individual at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, section 552.130, or section 552.136.

In summary, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office. With the exception of the information pertaining to the deceased individual at issue, the department must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and under sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The department 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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jlbm

Ms. Heather Silver - Page 4

Ref: ID# 834260

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)