



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 24, 2022

Mr. Gabriel A. Rodriguez
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2022-32732

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

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# 979960 (ORR# ACS5).

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified animal. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.1177 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.1177(a) of the Government Code relates to the humane disposition by a municipality or county of an animal and provides the following:

Except as provided by Subsection (b), information is confidential and excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to the name, address, telephone number, e-mail address, driver's license number, social security number, or other personally identifying information of a person who obtains ownership or control of an animal from a municipality or county making a humane disposition of the animal under a municipal ordinance or an order of the commissioners court.

Gov't Code § 552.1177(a). The city asserts the submitted information identifies a person who adopted an animal from the city's animal shelter. The city also represents its animal shelter made a humane disposition of the animal at issue under a municipal ordinance. Based on these representations, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1177 of the Government Code. However, section 552.117 is not applicable to the remaining information and the city may not withhold any of it on that ground.

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 exception encompasses section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, which states, in part, the following:

(a) Information that is contained in a municipal or county registry of dogs and cats under Section 826.031 that identifies or tends to identify the owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of the owner of the registered dog or cat is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]. The information contained in the registry may not include the social security number or the driver’s license number of the owner of the registered animal.

(b) The information may be disclosed only to a governmental entity or a person that, under a contract with a governmental entity, provides animal control services or animal registration services for the governmental entity for purposes related to the protection of public health and safety. A governmental entity or person that receives the information must maintain the confidentiality of the information, may not disclose the information under [the Act], and may not use the information for a purpose that does not directly relate to the protection of public health and safety.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0311(a), (b). Section 826.0311 applies only to the actual pet registry; it does not apply to the contents of other records, even though those documents may contain the same information as the pet registry. *See* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure). Upon review, we find the city has failed to establish section 826.0311(a) is applicable to the remaining information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1177 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining 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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jxd

Ref: ID# 979960

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)