



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2020

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

OR2020-16754

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# 835066 (ORR# B040820RP).

The City of Balch Springs (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all records related to the requestor's child or a named individual. The city states it is releasing some of the requested information. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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. This office has found 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. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The present request seeks all reports pertaining to a named individual who is not the requestor's minor child. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). This request requires the city to compile the named individual's criminal history and implicates the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the city has submitted information that does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not consist of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.118 of the Health and Safety Code is applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). This section makes the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. The city states it is part of an emergency communication district established under section 772.118 of the Health and Safety Code. Upon review, we conclude the city must withhold the telephone numbers and addresses it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.118 of the Health and Safety Code if the numbers and addresses consist of the originating telephone numbers and addresses furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. If the marked information does not consist of the originating telephone numbers and addresses provided by a 9-1-1 service supplier, it may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.118.

Some of the remaining information at issue is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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). 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 find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law

privacy. With the exception of the requestor's and her minor child's dates of birth, to which the requestor has a right of access pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, the city must also withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the city maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the telephone numbers and addresses it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.118 of the Health and Safety Code if the numbers and addresses consist of the originating telephone numbers and addresses furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the requestor's and her minor child's dates of birth, the city must also withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information to this requestor.¹

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

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information. *See* Fam. Code § 58.008(d); *but see id.* § 58.008(e)(2) (providing any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must be withheld from disclosure); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. If the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

Ms. Marie N. Johnson - Page 4

Ref: ID# 835066

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)