



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2022

Ms. Stephanie Hernandez  
Administrative Support Specialist  
City of Carrollton  
P.O. Box 110535  
Carrollton, Texas 75011-0535

OR2022-18683

Dear Ms. Hernandez:

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# 955855 (City ID Nos. T003454 and T003484).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for a specified incident report. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city received the two requests for information in close temporal proximity. We note you marked portions of the information to be withheld from the first requestor under section 552.108 of the Government Code, but do not seek to withhold this same information from the second requestor. Thus, we assume the city will release the information at issue to the second requestor. The Act does not permit the selective disclosure of information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold that exact information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988). Although you raise section 552.108 with respect to the inconsistently marked information, this section is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law), 177 (1977)

(governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108). Thus, the city may not withhold information from one requestor under section 552.108 that it has released to the other requestor. Accordingly, with respect to the information the city releases to either requestor, the city may not withhold such information from the other requestor under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 with respect to the information you seek to withhold from both requestors. Further, because sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code can make information confidential, we will address the applicability of these sections to the information at issue.

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 claiming 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); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information at issue relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude release of the information at issue will 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). Thus, with the exception of the information you have released to either requestor, the city may withhold the information you have marked section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 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.). We note the second requestor has a right of access to his own confidential information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to 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). Accordingly, the city must withhold the date of birth you have marked from the first requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note the second requestor has a right of access to his own e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.137(b). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address you have marked from the first requestor under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, with the exception of the information you have released to either requestor, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the date of birth you have marked from the first requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address you have marked from the first requestor under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information to these requestors.<sup>1</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,

Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/jxd

Ref: ID# 955855

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the second requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released to her. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.023(a), .137(b); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.