



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 21, 2020

Mr. Bill Delmore
Assistant District Attorney
District Attorney for the 9th Judicial District
207 West Phillips 2nd Floor
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2020-18110

Dear Mr. Delmore:

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# 838231 (ORR# 19F006179).

The 9th Judicial District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client. The district attorney's office states it has released some of the requested information, but claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."² 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).

¹ 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.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

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. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, the entirety of the requested information must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. Withholding only the identity of the individual whose information is at issue or certain details of the submitted information from this requestor would not preserve the common-law right of privacy of the individual at issue. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, the district attorney's office must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³

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/jxd

Ref: ID# 838231

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the arguments of the district attorney's office to withhold this information.