



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

September 25, 2009

Ms. Katie Lentz
Open Records
Williamson County Sheriff's Office
508 South Rock Street
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2009-13540

Dear Ms. Lentz:

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# 356440.

The Williamson County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received a request for information pertaining to a named Williamson County Jail inmate. You claim that some the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments from the requestor. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments concerning disclosure of requested information).

Initially, the requestor contends, and we agree, the sheriff did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Additionally, under 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 id.* § 552.301(e). The sheriff received the request for information on July 6, 2009. You state, and the requestor provides documentation showing, that you provided the requestor with a cost estimate that is in compliance with

section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.2615 (providing that governmental body shall provide requestor with estimate of charges if charges exceed \$40). The requestor complied with section 552.2615 by accepting the charges. *See id.* § 552.2615(b). Section 552.2615 of the Government Code provides that the submission of an estimate of charges to the requestor does not toll the governmental body's deadlines to ask for an attorney general decision under section 552.301. *See id.* § 552.2615(g) (providing that "[t]he time deadlines imposed by this section do not affect the application of a time deadline imposed on a governmental body under Subchapter G"); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 2-5 (1999) (addressing circumstances under which governmental body's communications to clarify or narrow request for information will toll section 552.301(b) deadlines). Accordingly, the ten business day deadline began on July 6, 2009. Thus, the sheriff was required to request a decision from this office by July 20, 2009. Consequently, because the sheriff submitted the request for a decision on July 22, 2009, we find the sheriff failed to comply with the 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 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 279 S.W.3d 806, 811 (Tex. App.—2007, pet. granted); *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). 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). Because your claims under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons for non-disclosure, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 such as section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers

used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Act of April 10, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 20, § 1, sec. 261.201, 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 113, 262, *amended by* Act of June 1, 2009, 81st Leg., R.S., ch. 779, §1, 2009 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 1965, 1965–66 (Vernon) (to be codified as an amendment to Fam. Code § 261.201(a)). You have marked the information you seek to withhold under section 261.201 in conjunction with section 552.101. However, upon review of the information at issue, we find it pertains to an investigation of a terroristic threat. Although Child Protective Services (“CPS”) was notified, the sheriff has not explained that the information at issue was used by CPS in an investigation conducted under chapter 261. Consequently, we find that you have failed to adequately demonstrate how this information was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.001 (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). We therefore conclude that section 261.201 is not applicable to the investigation at issue and the sheriff may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on such basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code. Chapter 411 deems confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or the Texas Crime Information Center. 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.” Gov’t Code § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Thus, the sheriff must withhold the CHRI we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 411.083(b)(3).

You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both elements of the test must be established. *See 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, a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. You have marked the information the sheriff seeks to withhold on this basis. We agree that the sheriff must withhold that information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. The constitutional right to privacy protects two types of interests. See Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *Id.* The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. See *id.*

The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. See Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common-law right to privacy; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." See *id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

In Open Records Decision No. 430 (1985), our office determined a list of inmate visitors is protected by constitutional privacy because people have a First Amendment right to correspond with inmates, and that right would be threatened if their names were released. See also, Open Records Decision Nos. 428 (1985), 185 (1978) (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 inmate free of the threat of public exposure). You assert that the information identifying inmate visitors and correspondents within the responsive information is excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy. We note the requestor is the inmate's authorized representative. Section 552.023(a) of the Government Code 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. Gov't Code § 552.023. Although the requestor's special right of access generally encompasses private information relating to her client, her client's correspondents and visitors also have privacy rights with respect to their correspondence and visitation with an inmate. Thus, because the constitutional rights of these correspondents and visitors are implicated, the requestor's special right of access does not extend to information pertaining to her client's correspondents and visitors. See ORD 430. Thus, we agree the submitted inmate visitation

information is protected by constitutional privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹

You also assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 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). We agree that the Texas driver's license information you have marked in the remaining information must be withheld under section 552.130.

In summary, the sheriff must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law and constitutional privacy. The sheriff must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code. The sheriff must withhold the information marked under section 552.130. The remaining information must be released.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/eeg

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

²We note the remaining information contains a social security number. 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. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Ms. Katie Lentz - Page 6

Ref: ID# 356440

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)