



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 30, 2004

Ms. M. Ann Montgomery
Assistant Ellis County & District Attorney
Ellis County
1201 N. Hwy 77, Suite B
Waxahachie, Texas 75165-5140

OR2004-7354

Dear Ms. Montgomery:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208197.

The Ellis County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to all times that the requestor has called the department and a department deputy has been dispatched to a particular residence for a specified period of time. The requestor subsequently clarified that she was seeking incident and offense reports, as well as call sheets, for a specified period of time and pertaining to a certain address. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used). You indicate that some of the requested information has been made available to the requestor. You claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from us and state the exceptions that apply to information that is requested of it not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state that the department received the requestor's request for information on April 20, 2004. You also state, and provide documentation showing, that the

department asked the requestor to clarify her request on April 23, 2004. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (stating that when governmental bodies are presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). Thus, the ten business day time period to request a decision from us under section 552.301(b) was tolled on the date that the department sought clarification of the request from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (providing that ten-day period is tolled during the clarification process). In addition, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the requestor clarified her request on June 8, 2004. Accordingly, we conclude that the ten business day time period for requesting a decision from our office resumed on June 9, 2004. Thus, the deadline for submitting a request for decision to us was June 17, 2004. You submitted your request for decision to us no earlier than June 22, 2004, which is the date of your letter requesting that decision. Consequently, we conclude that the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision from us.

Because the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision, the information at issue is now presumed public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *see also* *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The department must demonstrate a compelling interest in order to overcome the presumption that the information at issue is now public. *See id.* Normally, a compelling interest is demonstrated when some other source of law makes the information at issue confidential or third party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although the department claims that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code, we note that the department has not demonstrated a compelling interest under this exception to disclosure in this instance that would allow any portion of the submitted information to be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177(1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (need of another governmental body to withhold requested information may provide compelling reason for nondisclosure under section 552.108 in certain circumstances). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, since the department also claims that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code, we will address this particular claim.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by other statutes. Criminal history record information (“CHRI”) obtained from the National Crime Information

Center (the "NCIC") or the Texas Crime Information Center (the "TCIC") is confidential under federal and state law. Federal law governs the dissemination of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network. Federal regulations prohibit the release to the general public of CHRI that is maintained in state and local CHRI systems. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) ("Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given") and (c)(2) ("No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself"); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 10-12 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its own individual law with respect to CHRI that it generates. *See id.* at 10-12. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *See* Gov't Code § 411.089(b). Thus, CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may be disclosed only in accordance with the federal regulations. Likewise, CHRI held by the Texas Department of Public Safety (the "DPS") or another criminal justice agency must be withheld from the public as provided by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. After carefully reviewing your representations and the submitted information, we find that no portion of the information consists of CHRI from the NCIC or TCIC networks. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the federal regulations or subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code.

You also appear to raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the constitutional and common-law rights to privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses both the constitutional and common-law rights to privacy. The constitutional right to privacy protects two types of interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977). 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 Court. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981). The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 6-7 (1987); *see also Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *reh'g denied*, 770 F.2d 1081 (1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986). This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987). Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d at 492).

The common-law right to privacy protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary

sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). When a law enforcement agency compiles criminal history information that pertains to a particular individual, the compiled information takes on a character that implicates the individual's right to privacy in a manner that the same information in an uncompiled state does not. *See U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 616 at 2-3 (1993). The common-law right to privacy also encompasses the specific types of information that the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See* 540 S.W.2d at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has since concluded that other types of information also are private under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has determined to be private). After carefully reviewing your representations and the submitted information, we find that no portion of this information is protected from disclosure by either the constitutional or common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with either the constitutional or common-law right to privacy.

You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code. Chapter 772 authorizes the development of local emergency communications districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code apply only to an emergency 9-1-1 district established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These statutes make confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a service supplier. *See 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 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000. We assume that any emergency 9-1-1 district associated with the submitted information was established in accordance with chapter 772. We understand you to assert that the submitted information may not be released to the extent it contains the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers because such information is confidential under chapter 772. Accordingly, we conclude that to the extent that the originating telephone numbers and addresses of any 9-1-1 callers that you have marked were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier to a 9-1-1 district that is subject to section 772.118, 772.218, or 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, the telephone numbers and addresses must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code as information deemed confidential by statute.

Finally, we note that the remaining submitted information contains a social security number that may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law. The 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), make confidential social security numbers and related records that were obtained or are maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). The department has cited no law, nor are we aware of any law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990, that authorizes it to obtain or maintain social security numbers. Therefore, we have no basis for concluding that this social security number is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) of title 42 of the United States Code. We caution the department, however, that section 552.352 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing this social security number, the department should ensure that it was not obtained and is not maintained by the department pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

In summary, to the extent that the originating telephone numbers and addresses of any 9-1-1 callers that you have marked were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier to a 9-1-1 district that is subject to section 772.118, 772.218, or 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, the telephone numbers and addresses must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code as information deemed confidential by statute. A social security number contained within the remaining submitted information may be confidential under federal law. The department must release the remaining submitted information to the requestor to the extent that it has not already done so.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2)

notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/krl

Ref: ID# 208197

Enc. Marked documents

c: Ms. Pamela Eversole
743 Pipeline Court
Hurst, Texas 76053
(w/o enclosures)