



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 14, 2020

Mr. Tommy Gunn
Counsel for the City of Pinehurst
202 South Border Street
Orange, Texas 77630-6321

OR2020-17446

Dear Mr. Gunn:

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# 836364.

The City of Pinehurst (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to the death of a named individual. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information 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 (Tex. 1977). You state the information you indicated pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation.

¹ Although you do not cite to sections 552.101, 552.130, 552.137, or 552.147 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise these exceptions based on the substance of your arguments. Additionally, we note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code with respect to its claims under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, because these sections can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue 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 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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. This section 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. Further, 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.). We note 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 § 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”). Thus, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Additionally, we note an individual's name, address, or telephone number are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy). Accordingly, with the exception of the deceased

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

individual's date of birth, the city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens within the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of 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 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Because the right of privacy lapses at death, motor vehicle record information that pertains solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229; H-917; ORD 272. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the social security number of a living person. *See id.* § 552.147(a). We note the social security number at issue within the remaining information pertains to a deceased individual. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the deceased individual's date of birth, the city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens within the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city 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,

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/be

Ref: ID# 836364

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)