



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 26, 2006

Ms. Carla M. Cordova
Assistant General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2006-12701

Dear Ms. Cordova:

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# 262945.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client's appeal of a revocation of privileges to visit and correspond with death row inmates. You state that some responsive information will be released to the requestor. However, you claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. The constitutional right to privacy protects two types of interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985).

¹ Although you also initially raised sections 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code for portions of the requested information, in subsequent correspondence with our office you withdrew your arguments regarding these exceptions.

The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy” recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *Id.* The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.*

The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual’s privacy interests against the public’s need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common-law right to privacy; the material must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *See id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976), as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure;” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. Open Records Decision No. 185 (1978). The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates. In Open Records Decision No. 185, our office found that “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” Open Records Decision No. 185 (1978). Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 (1985) and 430 (1985), our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs which identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985). The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 430 (1985) (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors).

In this instance, the requestor obtained an authorization from her client. This authorization permits the release of “any and all information” related to the requestor’s client. The requestor also submitted authorizations from two inmates, which allow for the release of “TDCJ and MSCP logs reflecting my incoming and outgoing correspondence[,]” and “TDCJ and MSCP denial forms associated with my incoming and outgoing correspondence.” Section 552.023(a) of the Government Code states that a person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and is protected from

public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests. Gov't Code § 552.023. Accordingly, the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to the information listed in the three authorization forms. To the extent that the submitted information falls within the parameters of the three authorization forms it must be released to the requestor. However, to the extent the information is not covered by the authorization forms, this information must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.²

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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).

² As the records being released contain information that would be excepted from disclosure to the general public under laws and exceptions designed to protect privacy, if the department receives a future request for this information from an individual other than the requestor or her client, the department should again seek our decision.

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Gilbert N. Saenz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GNS/sdk

Ref: ID# 262945

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Yolanda Torres
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 515
Huntsville, Texas 77342-0515
(w/o enclosures)