



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 8, 2022

Ms. Amanda Davis
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2022-34796

Dear Ms. Davis:

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# 984117 (ORR Nos. P025449 & P025695).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for report number 22-000801. We understand the city will redact public citizens' dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2018-07366 (2018).¹ The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims 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

¹ Open Records Letter No. 2018-07366 authorizes the city to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

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. Upon review, we find portions of the submitted information, which we marked and noted, satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. In this instance, the city contends it does not possess the technological capability to redact information from audio files. However, because the city had the ability to copy the submitted audio recordings in order to submit them for our review, we believe the city has the capability to produce a copy of only the non-confidential portions of the audio recordings. Thus, the city may not withhold the entireties of the submitted audio recordings under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked and noted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.² Section 552.130 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. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked and noted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 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.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/jxd

Ref: ID# 984117

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)