



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 2020

Ms. Stacie S. White
Counsel for the City of Benbrook
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2020-15419

Dear Ms. White:

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# 834180.

The Benbrook Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named individual, including specified incidents. The department states it will withhold information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception 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. 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

¹ 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* Gov't Code § 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).

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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. The requestor asks, in part, for unspecified information held by the department concerning a named individual. However, the requestor also asks for information pertaining to specified incidents. Because the requestor specifically asks for this information, it is not part of a compilation of the individual's criminal history. Thus, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground. The remaining information does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Thus, this information does not consist of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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 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 agree the information that the department has highlighted satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information it has highlighted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.²

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 Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

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/jxd

Ref: ID# 834180

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)