



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 11, 2020

Mr. Mark G. Mann
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Garland
P.O. Box 469002
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2020-31121

Dear Mr. Mann:

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# 860076 (Reference No. GCA20-0894).

The City of Garland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to two specified incidents. You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the submitted information contains court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). As such, section 552.108 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, no portion of the court-filed documents we marked may not be withheld under section 552.108. However,

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.

we note one of the court-filed documents contains information subject to section 552.137, which makes information confidential under the Act.² Therefore, we will address the applicability of section 552.137 to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the remaining information at issue relates to pending criminal investigation. Based upon your representation and our review, we find 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). Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or a 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 the 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 individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, the city must withhold the date of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). We further note the requestor has a right of access to her own e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.137(b). Accordingly, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individual to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the date of birth you marked 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 individual to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

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,

Jahna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/rm

⁴ We note the information being released in this instance includes information that is confidential with respect to the general public. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party’s representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.

Ref: ID# 860076

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)