



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 13, 2007

Mr. John C. West
General Counsel
Office of the Inspector General
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 13084
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2007-10335

Dear Mr. West:

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# 286697.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice's Office of the Inspector General (the "OIG") received a request for information concerning a specified investigation involving the requestor. You state that you will release some of the requested information to the requestor, with redactions pursuant to the previous determination issued by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2005-01067 (2005).¹ You also state the OIG is withholding social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.² You claim that some of the

¹Open Records Letter No. 2005-01067 (2005) serves as a previous determination that the present and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of the department, regardless of whether the current or former employee complies with section 552.1175 of the Government Code, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code.

²We note that 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 under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.134 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the OIG's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(e-1) provides the following:

A governmental body that submits written comments to the attorney general under Subsection (e)(1)(A) shall send a copy of those comments to the person who requested the information from the governmental body. If the written comments disclose or contain the substance of the information requested, the copy of the comments provided to the person must be a redacted copy.

The OIG sent to the requestor a copy of its written comments submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(A). The OIG redacted its entire discussion of the exceptions asserted from the copy. After review of the copy of the OIG's brief sent to the requestor, we conclude that the OIG redacted information from the copy that does not disclose or contain the substance of the information requested; therefore, we conclude that the OIG failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982)*. This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when third-party interests are at stake or when information is made confidential by another source of law. *See* *Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977)* (construing predecessor statute). The OIG contends that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *Open Records Decision Nos. 473 at 2 (1987)* (discretionary exceptions under Act can be waived), 177 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the OIG may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.101 and 552.134 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome this presumption; therefore, we will address the OIG's arguments under these exceptions.

Section 552.134 of the Government Code provides that:

[e]xcept as provided by Subsection (b) or by Section 552.029 [of the Government Code], information obtained or maintained by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department.

Gov't Code § 552.134(a). Section 552.134 is explicitly made subject to section 552.029 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part as follows:

Notwithstanding . . . Section 552.134, the following information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the [department] is subject to required disclosure under Section 552.021:

(8) basic information regarding the death of an inmate in custody, an incident involving the use of force, or an alleged crime involving the inmate.

Id. § 552.029(8). The submitted information pertains to an inmate confined in a facility operated by the department. We find that section 552.134(a) is generally applicable to the submitted information. We note, however, that the submitted documents contain information regarding an incident of alleged criminal activity involving an inmate. Under section 552.029(8), basic information regarding this incident is subject to required disclosure.³

Although not excepted from disclosure under section 552.134, the OIG claims that the basic information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Information that tends to identify a victim of sexual assault is protected under common law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); cf. *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such

³Basic information includes the time and place of the incident, names of inmates and department officials directly involved, a brief narrative of the incident, a brief description of any injuries sustained, and information regarding criminal charges or disciplinary actions filed as a result of the incident.

information). Upon review, we conclude that the information at issue is not highly intimate or embarrassing and is of legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, the OIG may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the OIG must withhold the submitted information in Exhibit C under section 552.134 of the Government Code.

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).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Meesey", written in a cursive style.

Allan D. Meesey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADM/eeg

Ref: ID# 286697

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rosalinda P. Arevalo
P.O. Box 1356
Beeville, Texas 78104
(w/o enclosures)