



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 14, 2008

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

OR2008-11132

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

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# 318966.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for all internal affairs and public integrity records for a named individual. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, you assert that a portion of the submitted internal affairs investigation file is subject to section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108 provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

...

(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 [required public disclosure] if:

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

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(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). You contend that the information you have marked in the submitted internal investigation file is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) because it relates to a pending bribery investigation. You explain that the Dallas District Attorney's Office is in the process of formally indicting the named officer in this matter. You also state that the release of the marked information would compromise the safety of the complainants and witnesses and impact their ability to cooperate in the prosecution of this offense. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated that the release of information you have marked in the submitted internal affairs investigation file 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). Accordingly, the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

Next, you claim that the cellular telephone numbers of police officers, which you have marked, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from required public disclosure an internal record of a law enforcement agency maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution if “release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution.” Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body that seeks to withhold information under section 552.108(b)(1) must sufficiently explain how and why the release of the information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws); Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 531 at 2 (1989). In Open Records Decision No. 506 (1988), this office determined that the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b) excepted from disclosure “cellular mobile phone numbers assigned to county officials and employees with specific law enforcement responsibilities.” *Id.* at 2. We noted that the purpose of the cellular telephones was to ensure immediate access to individuals with specific law enforcement responsibilities and that public access to these numbers could interfere with that purpose. *Id.* You assert that

¹As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

the release of these cellular telephone numbers would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the department may withhold the cellular telephone numbers you have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Next, you indicate that the submitted internal investigation file contains information that is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. Chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 911 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. See Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 911 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000. We understand that the City of Dallas is part of an emergency communication district established under section 772.318. You have marked the telephone number and address of a 911 caller that you seek to withhold. To the extent that the marked information was furnished by a 911 service supplier, we agree that it must be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

Next, you assert that the criminal history information you have marked is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.101 also 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 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. United States 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. Accordingly, we find that the criminal history information you have marked under common-law privacy is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public

interest. Thus, the criminal history information you have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, we address your contention that a portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information that relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the department must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130.

Next, you assert that the employee identification numbers you have marked the submitted internal investigation file are confidential under section 552.136(b) of the Government Code, which 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." *Id.* § 552.136. You inform us that an employee's identification number is also used as an employee's credit union bank account number. Thus, the department must withhold the information that you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code, as well as the police officers' cellular telephone numbers that you have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold: (1) the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, to the extent that the marked information was furnished by a 911 service supplier; (2) the criminal history information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the Texas motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (4) the employee identification numbers you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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). 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, 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,



Bill Longley
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BL/eeg

Ms. J. Middlebrooks - Page 6

Ref: ID# 318966

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tanya Eiserer
The Dallas Morning News
508 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)