



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 23, 2008

Mr. Stan O. Springerley
Smith County Civil Attorney & Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Smith County Courthouse
100 North Broadway, 4th Floor
Tyler, Texas 75702

OR2008-05347

Dear Mr. Springerley:

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# 307126.

The Smith County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received a request for the names and employee identification numbers for all deputies currently employed by the sheriff. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.127 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have redacted portions of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .301(e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, that you have been authorized to withhold any of the redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). As such, these types of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of a small portion of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the sheriff should refrain from redacting any information that it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling. For the redacted information that we are unable to discern, the sheriff has failed to comply with section 552.301, and such information is presumed public under section 552.302. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302. Thus, we conclude that the sheriff must release the remaining redacted information to the requestor. If you believe that the remaining redacted information is confidential and may not lawfully be released, you must challenge this ruling in court as outlined below.

We next note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in part:

(a) the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

...

(2) the name, sex, ethnicity, salary, title, and dates of employment of each employee and officer of a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(2). The information at issue includes employee names. The sheriff must release this information unless it is expressly confidential under other law. You claim that the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We note that these sections are discretionary exceptions that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W. 3d 469, 475-76 (Tex.App.-Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108). As such, the sheriff may not withhold the information that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.108. However, because sections 552.102, 552.117, and 552.127 are "other law" for purposes of section 552.022, we will address your arguments regarding these sections for the information that is subject to section 552.022, as well as the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). Information is protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy if (1) it contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) it is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See id.* at 685. 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. *Id.* at 683.

In addition, this office has found that some medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). We note, however, that information about a public employee's qualifications, disciplinary action and background is not protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications and performance and the circumstances of his resignation or termination), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101 or 552.102), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under either the constitutional or common-law right of privacy). Upon review, we find that none of the information is highly intimate or embarrassing, and therefore no portion of the information may be withheld under section 552.102 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code.¹ However, the submitted documents do not include any information subject to section 552.117; therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.127 excepts from disclosure information that "identifies a person as a participant in a neighborhood crime watch organization and relates to the name, home address, business address, home telephone number, or business telephone number of the person." Gov't Code § 552.127(a); *see also id.* § 552.127(b) (defining "neighborhood crime watch organization"). Upon review, we find the information at issue does not identify a participant in a neighborhood crime watch organization. Therefore, none of the information may be withheld under section 552.127.

In regard to the remaining information, you raise sections 552.103 and 552.108. Section 552.103 provides in part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or

¹Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. See *Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex.App.-Austin 2002, no pet.); *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex.App.-Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex.App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). ORD 551 at 4.

You have failed to demonstrate how the sheriff reasonably anticipated or was involved in pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the sheriff may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

- (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;
- (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;
- (3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or
- (4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a), (b). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* §§ 552.108, .301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). You have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108 to the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must reasonably explain how and why exception is applicable to the information at issue). Therefore, none of the information may be withheld on that basis. As your raise no other exceptions against disclosure, the information must be released 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 file suit in

Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/jb

Ref: ID# 307126

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rebecca Costell
P.O. Box 524
Culver City, California 90232
(w/o enclosures)