



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 20, 2022

Ms. Shawnta A. Adams
Assistant City Attorney
City of Arlington
Post Office Box 1065
Arlington, Texas 76004

OR2022-28970

Dear Ms. Adams:

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# 973029 (Ref. No. R136256).

The Arlington Police Department (the "department") received a request for police records pertaining to the requestor. 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. This section encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k). Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201). Thus, the information we have marked is within the scope of section 261.201(a). In this instance, although the requestor is a parent of the child victim named in the marked information, the child victim is now an adult. Thus, the requestor does not have a right of access to the marked information under section 261.201(k). *Id.* § 261.201(k). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. 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. The requestor knows the identity of the individual involved and the nature of the incident in Exhibit C. Therefore, withholding only the individual’s identity or certain details of the incident from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual’s common-law right of privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the

information relates, the department must withhold Exhibit C in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in relevant part the following:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 at 3-4 (1988), 370 at 2 (1983), 343 at 1 (1982). Upon review, we find the department has not established any of the information consists of records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician. Thus, the information is not confidential under the MPA, and the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 on that ground.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 SW.2d at 685. 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). The requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or 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 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 no implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Nevertheless, the department must withhold the submitted dates of birth that do not pertain to the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, child rearing, and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspect of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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.¹ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The department must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the submitted dates of birth that do not pertain to the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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.

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

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,

Justin H. Miller
Attorney
Open Records Division

JHM/eb

Ref: ID# 973029

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)