



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 17, 2012

Mr. B. Chase Griffith  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2012-16573

Dear Mr. Griffith:

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# 468051 (ORR# 10-5830).

The McKinney Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the arrest of a named individual. You claim the requested 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.

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 common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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.

The type of information considered intimate or 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. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded that, generally, only that information which either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. Open Records Decision No 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open

Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). In this instance, the requestor, as the representative of the suspect named in the report, knows the identity of the alleged victim. Therefore, withholding only identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common law right to privacy. We conclude, therefore, the submitted information is private in its entirety.

We note, however, the requestor is an investigator with the United States Department of State's Bureau of Diplomatic Security, who is requesting the information at issue on behalf of the United States Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") as part of a background investigation for a national security or public trust employment position. OPM is authorized to perform background investigations of prospective federal employees to ensure applicants have not broken the law or engaged in other conduct making them ineligible for federal employment. *See Mittleman v. Office of Pers. Mgmt.*, 76 F.3d 1240, 1243 (D.C. Cir. 1996); *see also* 5 U.S.C. §§ 3301 (president may prescribe regulations for admission of individuals into civil service), 1304 (investigations conducted by OPM), 1104 (president may delegate personnel management functions to OPM); 5 C.F.R. pts. 731, 732, 736 (authorizing OPM to investigate applicants for federal employment). OPM is subject to Executive Order Number 10, 450, which provides, "[t]he appointment of each civilian officer or employee in any department or agency of the Government shall be made subject to investigation." Exec. Order No. 10, 450, § 3, 18 Fed. Reg. 2489 (Apr. 27, 1953), reprinted as amended in 5 U.S.C. § 7311 (2000). While the scope of the investigation depends on the relation of the employment to national security, "in no event shall the investigation include less than a national agency check (including a check for the fingerprint files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and written inquiries to appropriate local law enforcement agencies[.]" *Id.*

OPM has a right of access to the criminal history record information ("CHRI") of state and local criminal justice agencies when its investigation is conducted with the consent of the individual being investigated. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 9101(b)(1), (c). CHRI is defined as "information collected by criminal justice agencies on individuals consisting of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, indictments, informations, or other formal criminal charges, and any disposition arising therefrom, sentencing, correction supervision and release;" but it does not include "identification information such as fingerprint records to the extent that such information does not indicate involvement in the criminal justice system" or "records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law from access by State and local criminal justice agencies of that State or locality." *Id.* § 9101(a)(2). Furthermore, federal law provides OPM's right of access to CHRI preempts state confidentiality provisions. *Id.* § 9101(b)(4) (section 9101 "shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of law . . . of any State").

The requestor has submitted written consent from the individual under investigation for the release of that individual's CHRI. Accordingly, because the requestor seeks information as part of an investigation conducted on behalf of OPM, the requestor has a right of access to CHRI held by the department regarding the individual under investigation. In addition, we conclude such a right of access under federal law preempts the common-law right to privacy under Texas law. *See English v. General Elec. Co.*, 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *see also Louisiana Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting that federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation). Therefore, the department must release the CHRI relating to the individual under investigation to this requestor. The department must withhold the remaining portion of the information at issue from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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](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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 468051

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)