



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 19, 2008

Sheriff Dennis D. Wilson
Limestone County Sheriff's Department
1221 East Yeagua Street
Groesbeck, Texas 76642

OR2008-06819

Dear Sheriff Wilson:

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# 310314.

The Limestone County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to traffic arrests, protective orders, and criminal records of named individuals. You state that you will release a portion of the information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.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." 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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law

¹ We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that a compilation of an individual's criminal history record information is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Here, because the requestor asks for unspecified records involving named individuals, the request implicated those individuals' right to privacy. However, information relating to routine traffic violations is not excepted from release under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *Cf. Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B)*. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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." Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (a)(2). The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that "[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from" required public disclosure under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147. The department may withhold the submitted social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.²

We note, however, that the requestor indicates that he is the Chief of the Dallas Police Department and is seeking the requested information in his official capacity. This office has concluded that information subject to the Act may be transferred between governmental bodies without waiving exceptions to the public disclosure of that information or affecting its confidentiality. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-590 (1986); Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 567 (1990), 561 (1990), 516 (1989). These decisions are based on the well-settled policy of this state that governmental agencies should cooperate with each other in the interest of the efficient and economical administration of their statutory duties. *See* ORD 516. However, the transfer of confidential information from one governmental body to another is prohibited where the relevant confidentiality statute authorizes release of the confidential information only to specific entities, and the requesting governmental body is not among the statute's enumerated entities. *See* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4

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.

n. 6 (1995) (intergovernmental transfer permitted under statutory confidentiality provision only where disclosure to another governmental agency is required or authorized by law), JM-590 at 4-5 (1986) (where governmental body is not included among expressly enumerated entities to which confidential information may be disclosed, information may not be transferred to that governmental body); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 650 (1996) (transfer of confidential information to federal agency impermissible unless federal law requires its disclosure). However, sections 552.130 and 552.147 and the doctrine of common-law privacy do not have specific release provisions governing public release of information. Thus, pursuant to the intergovernmental transfer doctrine, the department has the discretion to release to the requestor the information marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, section 552.130 and section 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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,



Olivia A. Maceo
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

OM/mcf

Ref: ID# 310314

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David M. Kunkle
Chief of Police
Dallas Police Department
1400 South Lamar Street
Dallas, Texas 75215
(w/o enclosures)