



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 24, 2008

Mr. Philip A. DeFriend  
Assistant General Counsel  
TDCJ – Office of the General Counsel  
P.O. Box 4004  
Huntsville, Texas 77342

OR2008-10065

Dear Mr. DeFriend:

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# 316736.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the “department”) received a request for information related to a named death row inmate, excluding medical records. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the department’s obligations under the Act regarding the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body receiving an open records request for information that it wishes to withhold pursuant to one of the exceptions to public disclosure is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e). You state that the department received the request on May 5, 2008. Accordingly, you were required to submit the written comments and requested information to us by May 27, 2008. However, you did not submit the

information required under section 552.301(e) until May 28, 2008. Consequently, we find that the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e) 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* Gov't Code § 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. *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the department has waived its claim under section 552.108. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to withhold the submitted information, we will consider your arguments under this exception.

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 exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. Criminal history record information ("CHRI") obtained from the National Crime Information Center or the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions." *Id.* § 411.082(2). Federal law governs the dissemination of CHRI obtained from the National Crime Information Center network. Federal regulations prohibit the release to the general public of CHRI maintained in state and local CHRI systems. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) ("Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given") and (c)(2) ("No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself"). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its own individual law with respect to CHRI that it generates. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 10-12 (1990); *see generally* Gov't Code ch. 411 subch. F. Although sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *See id.* § 411.089(b). However, section 411.081(b) of the Government Code allows a criminal justice agency to disclose to the public CHRI "that is related to the offense for which a person is involved in the criminal justice system." *Id.* § 411.081(b). We have marked CHRI that the department must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government

Code. However, we note that an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for purposes of section 552.101. Accordingly, we conclude that none of the remaining information at issue is confidential under chapter 411 and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system).<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy 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).

In Open Records Decision No. 396, we considered whether certain types of information pertaining to inmate trust accounts were protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 396 (1983). We found that information regarding balances held in inmate accounts is highly intimate or embarrassing. *Id.* at 1. Furthermore, we concluded that there is not a legitimate public interest in inmate account balances because "the total amount an inmate has on deposit at any particular time[] does not . . . relate to the receipt or expenditure of public funds." *Id.* at 1. Accordingly, we determined that information regarding inmate account balances is protected under common-law privacy. *Id.* at 1. Thus, in accordance with the decision in Open Records Decision No. 396, we agree that the inmate's account balances in the submitted records are protected by common-law privacy. Therefore, the department must withhold the inmate account balances, which we have marked, along with some additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The constitutional right to privacy is also encompassed by section 552.101. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987). Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that an individual may obtain his own CHRI from DPS. *Id.* § 411.083(3).

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. ORD 185. 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." ORD 185. 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 and 430, 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. ORD 430. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. See also ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public's interest in this information. *Id.*; see ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). We note that although the requestor is the representative of the inmate, the requestor does not have a right of access to this information under section 552.023 of the Government Code because the constitutional rights of the visitors are also implicated.<sup>2</sup> See ORD 430. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. You also seek to withhold information relating to inmate family members under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

In summary, under section 552.101 of the Government Code, the department must withhold the information we have marked (1) in conjunction with federal law and subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code; (2) in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (3)

---

<sup>2</sup>Government Code section 552.023(a) 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.

in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.<sup>3</sup>

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,

---

<sup>3</sup>You inquire whether "a death row inmate's date of birth can be released[.]" and assert that section 552.029 of the Government Code "allows disclosure of an inmate's age but does not provide [for] the release of an inmate's date of birth." We note that section 552.029 specifically makes public certain information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department. However, section 552.029 does not expressly make information confidential. See Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied), 478 at 2 (1987) (language of confidentiality statute controls scope of protection), 465 at 4-5 (1987) (statute explicitly required confidentiality).

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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 316736

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. George Kendall  
Holland & Knight L.L.P.  
195 Broadway 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10007-3189  
(w/o enclosures)