



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 16, 2020

Ms. Julie Pandya Doshier
Counsel for the City of Farmers Branch
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
500 North Akard, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-23419

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 847702 (City's File# 117061).

The City of Farmers Branch (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client. The city states it is withholding some of the requested information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 2017-05218 (2017).¹ The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

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 section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

[T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor pursuant to section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2017-05218 authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general's decision. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the city has not established the information it has marked under section 261.201 was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code or consists of a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201). Therefore, this information is not confidential under section 261.201(a) of the Family Code and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). Upon review, we find the city has not established section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code is applicable to the information it marked under that section. Therefore, the city may not withhold this under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 418.182(a) of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part, “information . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.” *Id.* § 418.182(a). The fact that information may be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is confidential under section 418.182(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. However, the remaining information is not confidential under section 418.182(a), and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *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). 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. Upon review, we agree the information that the city has marked and indicated under common-law privacy satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information it has marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. The city must also withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.²

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/rm

² Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

Ref: ID# 847702

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)