



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 13, 2008

Ms. Sylvia McClellan
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Section
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2008-08115

Dear Ms. McClellan:

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# 312655.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for the internal affairs files of three named police officers. You claim that portions of the submitted files are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we must address the city'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. Pursuant

¹We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a government 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.

²We 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.

to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(a), (b). You state that the city received both requests for information on April 1, 2008. However, we note that both requests bear stamps reflecting that they were actually received by the city on March 21, 2008. Accordingly, you were required to request a decision from this office by April 4, 2008. You did not submit your request for a decision from this office until April 9, 2008. Consequently, we find that the city failed to comply with the requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the submitted information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). However, the need of another governmental body to withhold information under section 552.108 can provide a compelling reason under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 3 (1991). Because you state that the Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") objects to the release of the requested information, we will consider the applicability of section 552.108. We will also address your arguments under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code, as these exceptions can provide compelling reasons to overcome this presumption.

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 that (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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual's criminal history 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. Upon review, we agree that some of the information at issue constitutes a compilation of an individual's criminal history that is not of legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, this information, which we have marked, is subject to common-law privacy. However, we find that none of the remaining information you have marked under common-law privacy is a compilation of an individual's criminal history. *See, e.g.,* Gov't Code § 411.081(b) (providing that an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information). Further, you do not otherwise explain, and the documents do not reflect, how this information is subject to common-law privacy. Consequently, the city must only withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. The MPA governs the public availability of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). We have also found that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or "[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician." Open Records Decision No.546 (1990). Upon review, we agree that most of the documents you have marked under section 159.002 constitute medical records. These medical records may

only be released in accordance with the MPA.³ However, we find that you have failed to establish that the remaining information you marked under this exception constitutes medical records or information obtained from those medical records. These documents, which we have marked, are not subject to the MPA.

We now turn to your argument regarding the information you have marked under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108 (a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d706 (Tex. 1977). We note that the information you seek to withhold relates to internal affairs investigations concerning employees with the city’s police department. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to information relating to an administrative investigation that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982).

In this instance, however, you explain that all of the information you have marked also relates to pending prosecutions by the district attorney. You indicate that the district attorney objects to the release of this information, as it would interfere with these pending prosecutions. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated that the release of the information you have marked under section 552.108 would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.]1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 372 (1983) (where incident involving allegedly criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to incident).

We note, and you acknowledge, that the police reports you have marked under section 552.108 contain basic information. Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-87; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). The city must withhold the Texas-issued motor vehicle registration information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. You inform us that the city employees' identification numbers are also used as these employees' credit union bank account numbers. Based on this representation, the city must withhold the employee identification numbers that you have marked under section 552.136.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with both common-law privacy. The city may only release the marked medical records in accordance with the MPA. The city must withhold the information it has marked under sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code. Finally, except for basic information, the city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(1) on behalf of the district attorney. The remaining 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,



Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 312655

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Teresa Cain
Mills & Williams, L.L.P.
5910 North Central Expressway, Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75206
(w/o enclosures)