



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 3, 2004

Mr. Noble D. Walker, Jr.
Assistant City Attorney, Greenville, Texas
Scott, Walker & Bench
P. O. Box 1353
Greenville, Texas 75403-1353

OR2004-7552

Dear Mr. Walker:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208612.

The Greenville Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified person. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information contains social security numbers that may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law.¹ 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 these social security numbers are

¹ Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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.

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 these social security numbers, the department should ensure that they were not obtained and are not maintained by the department pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the constitutional and common-law rights to privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by the constitutional and common-law rights to privacy. Information is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *See id.* at 683.

The constitutional right to privacy encompasses two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987)*. The first type of constitutional privacy protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *See id.* The scope of information protected by constitutional privacy is narrower than that under the doctrine of common-law privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find that portions of the information that we have marked are protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, we conclude that the department must withhold this particular marked information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. However, because we also find that no other portion of the submitted information is protected from disclosure by either the common-law or constitutional rights to privacy, we also conclude that the department may not withhold any other portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on these bases.

You also claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from

disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, we conclude that the department must withhold the Texas motor vehicle information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, social security numbers contained within the submitted information may be confidential under federal law. The department must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining submitted information to the requestor.

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# 208612

Enc. Marked documents

c: Mr. Thomas Rowe Kendrick
Looney, Nichols & Johnson, P.L.L.C.
528 N.W. 12th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103
(w/o enclosures)