



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 21, 2010

Ms. P. Armstrong
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Division
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2010-16000

Dear Ms. Armstrong:

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# 397557 (DPD ORR 2010-06369).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for twenty-two categories of information pertaining to a specified address for the last five years. You claim a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the department's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(b)*. Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, the governmental body 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). In this instance, you state the department received the request for information on July 12, 2010. You did not, however, request a ruling from this office or submit a copy of the information requested until August 17, 2010. Thus, we find the department 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 requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *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, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider your claim under that exception.

Next, we note you only submitted a police officer's name and identification number. You state the department submitted a representative sample of information for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must submit, in connection with request for attorney general decision, the requested information or representative samples thereof). In our opinion, however, the submitted information is not representative of most of the categories of information requested. Please be advised this open records letter applies to only the type of information you have submitted for our review. Therefore, this opinion does not authorize the withholding of any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office. *See id.* § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of section 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). To the extent information responsive to categories two through twenty-two of the request existed on the date the department received the request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

We now address your argument against the disclosure of the information you submitted for our review. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Information is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy when (1) it is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary

sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. 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 prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* 681-82. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. We note an individual's name, home address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers not protected under privacy).

You claim the name and identification number of the undercover officer are confidential pursuant to common-law privacy and "special circumstances." However, the Third Court of Appeals recently ruled the "special circumstances" exception found in past Attorney General Open Records Decisions directly conflicts with Texas Supreme Court precedent regarding common-law privacy. *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. and Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 287 S.W.3d 390 (Tex. App.—Austin 2009, pet. granted). The court of appeals ruled the two-part test set out in *Industrial Foundation* is the "sole criteria" for determining whether information can be withheld under common-law privacy. *Id.*; see also *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 686. In this instance, the information at issue consists of an undercover officer's name and identification number. Upon review, we find this information is not highly intimate or embarrassing. As you failed to meet the first prong of the *Industrial Foundation* test for privacy, we find the information at issue is not confidential under common-law privacy and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101.

We note the 81st Legislature enacted section 552.151 of the Government Code, which relates to a public employee or officer's safety.¹ This section provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.151. In this instance, you explain the release of the undercover officer's name and identification number would jeopardize the officer's safety. Based on your representation and our review, we find the department has demonstrated release of the undercover officer's name and identification number would subject the officer to a

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

substantial threat of physical harm. Accordingly, the department must withhold this information under section 552.151.

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,



Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/tp

Ref: ID# 397557

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)