



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 17, 2022

Mr. David V. Overcash  
Counsel for the City of Anna  
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.  
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-31821

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 978506 (Ref. No. W004001-072022).

The City of Anna (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified incident report. The city states it has released some of the requested information. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

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). The city states 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). Accordingly, we find the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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 requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth, her minor child’s date of birth, and her spouse’s date of birth as she is acting as his authorized representative 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 individual requests information concerning himself). Thus, with the exception of the dates of birth belonging to the requestor, the requestor’s minor child, and the requestor’s spouse, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the dates of birth belonging to the requestor, the requestor’s minor child, and the requestor’s spouse, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

<sup>2</sup> We note the requestor has a right of access to the information at issue pursuant to section 58.008(d) of the Family Code. *See* Fam. Code § 58.008(d); *but see id.* § 58.008(e)(2) (providing any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must be withheld from disclosure). If the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

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,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/jxd

Ref: ID# 978506

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)