



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 24, 2010

Ms. Elizabeth Lutton
Legal Advisor
Dallas County Sheriff's Department
133 Riverfront, LB-31
Dallas, Texas 75207-4313

OR2010-07505

Dear Ms. Lutton:

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# 380987.

The Dallas County Sheriff's Department (the "sheriff") received a request for all information pertaining to a named deceased individual. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). In this instance, the submitted information is part of a completed investigation conducted by the sheriff. Pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code, a completed investigation made by a governmental body is expressly public unless it is either excepted under 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly confidential under other law. Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception that protects a governmental body's interest and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.— Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 is not other law that makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022. Consequently, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.101, we will consider whether any of the submitted information must be withheld under that exception.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 constitutional privacy, which 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 (5th Cir. 1981); Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987). 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 (5th Cir. 1985); Open Records Decision No. 455 at 6-7 (1987). 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).

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


¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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." *Id.* 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, 428. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See* 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). Upon review, we find that some of the submitted information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the inmate visitation information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Christopher D. Sterner
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDSA/eeg

Ref: ID# 380987

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)