



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 19, 2022

Mr. Jeremy Anato-Mensah  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-39437

Dear Mr. Anato-Mensah:

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# 990818 [ORR E004655].

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident.<sup>1</sup> You state some information has been released. 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 "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Court. See *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. See *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. See ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. See *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). However, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. See *Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004).

Because the submitted information relates to a deceased individual, the submitted information may not be withheld from disclosure based on the deceased individual's privacy interests. However, you state you notified the deceased individual's family of the request for information and of the family's right to assert a privacy interest in the information at issue. We have received comments from the deceased individual's family asserting a privacy interest in the information at issue and objecting to its release. After reviewing the submitted comments and the information at issue, we find the family's privacy interest in the information we have indicated outweighs the public's interest in the disclosure of this information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted photographs under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.

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,

Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/jxd

Ref: ID# 990818

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)