



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 13, 2020

Mr. Brandon Dyson
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Angelo
72 West College Avenue
San Angelo, Texas 76903

OR2020-28565

Dear Mr. Dyson:

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# 853493 (City File No. P001543-082420).

The San Angelo Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specified incident report. You claim portions of the submitted information are 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. 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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 conclude some of the submitted information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the department must withhold the information you have marked

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the department 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/eb

Ref: ID# 853493

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("a person or person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to a 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). Accordingly, if the department receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a ruling from this office.