



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2022

Ms. Teresa L. Presley
Records Manager
City of Frisco
7200 Stonebrook Parkway
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-19187

Dear Ms. Presley:

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# 956994 (Reference # P057316-041822).

The City of Frisco (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is 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. 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.). Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy.

You seek to withhold the entirety of the submitted information under common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated this is a situation in which the information at issue must be withheld in its entirety under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we conclude portions of the submitted information meet the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, the requestor is the spouse of the individual whose privacy interests are at issue. Thus, the requestor may be the authorized representative of that individual and may have a right of access to information pertaining to the individual that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. 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 individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, if the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, then the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, if the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of her spouse, then the city may not withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. Further, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the city must release the remaining information.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,

Cesar Mata
Attorney
Open Records Division

CM/mo

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. 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.

Teresa L. Presley - Page 3

Ref: ID# 956994

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)