



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 13, 2022

Ms. Bridgette Begle
Counsel for the City of Humble
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2022-38554

Dear Ms. Begle:

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# 989860 (Reference# COHM22-053).

The City of Humble (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for 9-1-1 audio recordings and transcripts related to a specified incident. You state the city will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code and in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of 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 representative sample of information.²

¹ We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

² We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. See Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 1.5 million. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000. The city states it is part of an emergency communication district established under chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code. Upon review, however, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information consists of an originating telephone number or address provided by a 9-1-1 service supplier. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.118, section 772.218, or section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Thus, 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.

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

letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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,

Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/mo

Ref: ID# 989860

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)