



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 23, 2022

Ms. Lauren Azopardi  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-14814

Dear Ms. Azopardi:

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# 948964 (ORR# E001696).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for report number 220127579. We understand the city will redact dates of birth of members of the public pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2016-00620 (2016).<sup>1</sup> The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims 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. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Letter No. 2016-00620 authorizes the city to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting an attorney general decision. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy number we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

---

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

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy number we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information to this requestor.<sup>3</sup>

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 948964

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup> We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground 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). Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.