



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 21, 2022

Ms. Stephanie Berry
Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney Street
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2022-21320

Dear Ms. Berry:

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# 961280 (Reference No. R000651-042822).

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for information related 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 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, 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 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 the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. You seek to withhold the entirety of

the submitted information under common-law privacy. However, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the submitted information must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, 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 you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). The city indicates it is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city states the information at issue consists of the originating telephone number and address furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. Accordingly, to the extent the telephone number and address we marked were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. Conversely, to the extent the information at issue was not supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of section 772.318.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 (1978). The submitted documents reveal the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the telephone numbers and addresses we marked were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information.

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/be

Ref: ID# 961280

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)