



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 16, 2020

Ms. Amanda Rice
Deputy City Attorney
City of Temple
2 North Main Street, Suite 308
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2020-23408

Dear Ms. Rice:

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# 845144 (ORR# 20-1561).

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for police records pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's client and a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed 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 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. 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.).

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. The city seeks to withhold the entirety of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, the requestor informs us his client is the spouse and authorized representative of the named individual. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to this information. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are 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). In addition, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city must release the submitted 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,

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/rm

¹As noted above, the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

Ms. Amanda Rice - Page 3

Ref: ID# 845144

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)