



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 25, 2020

Mr. Evaristo Garcia, Jr.
Assistant City Attorney
City of McAllen
P.O. Box 220
McAllen, Texas 78505-0220

OR2020-16558

Dear Mr. Garcia:

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# 833261 (ORR# W020123).

The City of McAllen (the "city") received a request for four specified requests for public information from three named requestors and all documents released in response to two of the requests at issue. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has not submitted the specified requests for public information. To the extent any such information existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time.¹ *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note the requestor seeks information that was previously released in response to prior requests under the Act. The Act does not permit the selective disclosure of

¹ We understand the city will withhold e-mail addresses of members of the public pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684, which is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

information to the public. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). Information that has been voluntarily released to a member of the public may not subsequently be withheld from another member of the public, unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988). Accordingly, the city may not withhold previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. We note the information at issue was released to the prior requestors pursuant to a special right of access. *See id.* § 552.023 (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Further, as section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy makes information confidential under law, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the submitted information.

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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the submitted information contains information that is considered highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate concern to the public. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the report from this requestor would not preserve the individual's common-law right of privacy. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold the submitted information from this requestor in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 833261

c: Requestor