



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2013

Mr. Jimmy A. Cassels  
For the City of Alto  
Cassels & Reynolds, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1626  
Lufkin, Texas 75902-1626

OR2013-07403

Dear Mr. Cassels:

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# 486189.

The City of Alto (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information on five named police officers. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.115 and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested third party may submit comment stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, the requestor asserts she was not timely notified of the city's request for a ruling from this office as required by section 552.301(d) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.301(d) (governmental body must provide requestor with copy of governmental body's written communication to attorney general asking for decision). Pursuant to section 552.302, a governmental body's failure to timely provide the requestor with a copy of its written communication to this office results in the presumption that the information is public. We note the city's request for a decision to this office was timely submitted and shows it was copied to the requestor. This office is unable to resolve disputes of fact in the open records ruling process. Accordingly, we must rely upon the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our opinion, or upon those facts that are discernable from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See* Open Records Decision No. 522 at 4 (1990). Based on the submitted information, we find the city complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(d) in copying the requestor on the correspondence requesting this ruling.

However, section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code requires a governmental body that submits written comments requesting a ruling to the attorney general under subsection 552.301(e)(1)(A), to send a copy of those comments to the person who requested the information from the governmental body not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(e-1). Section 552.301(e-1) authorizes the governmental body to redact information from those written comments that discloses or contains the substance of the information requested. *Id.* We note the city redacted virtually the entirety of its arguments in support of its raised exceptions in the copy of the comments sent to the requestor. We further note the redacted portions of the city's comments neither disclose nor contain the substance of the submitted information. We, therefore, conclude the city failed to comply with section 552.301(e-1) in requesting a decision with respect to its arguments under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.115, and 552.117 of the Government Code.

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 unless the governmental body overcomes this presumption by demonstrating a compelling reason to withhold the information. *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); Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason generally exists when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3, 325 at 2 (1982). Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *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 Nos. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Thus, in failing to comply with section 552.301, the city has waived its argument under section 552.103 and may not withhold the submitted information on this basis. However, sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.115, and 552.117 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to withhold information. Therefore, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information.

We note the submitted information contains confidential criminal history record information ("CHRI"). 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 laws that make CHRI confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. 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.” *Id.* § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the National Crime Information Center network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). *See generally* Gov’t Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See id.* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411, subchapter F. Accordingly, the city must withhold the CHRI we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law and chapter 411 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. This section makes confidential L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms required by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (“TCLEOSE”). Section 1701.306 provides, in part:

(a) [TCLEOSE] may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a physical examination, blood test, or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCLEOSE]. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a), (b). The city must withhold the L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms we have

marked in the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), which governs access to medical records. Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002. Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004. The information we have marked consists of a medical record subject to the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 159.002 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *See id.* at 681-82. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information. We further note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including L-2 and L-3 declarations under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.

an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 455 at 9 (1987) (employment applicant's salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). However, we note there is a legitimate public interest in an applicant's background and qualifications for government employment, especially where the applicant was seeking a position in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2. Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See* ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

You also claim the submitted information is excepted from required disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. For many years, this office determined section 552.101, in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, protected information from disclosure when "special circumstances" exist in which the disclosure of information would place an individual in imminent danger of physical harm. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 169 (1977)

(special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution), 123 (1976) (information protected by common-law right of privacy if disclosure presents tangible physical danger). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held freedom from physical harm does not fall under the common-law right to privacy. *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112 (Tex. 2011) (holding "freedom from physical harm is an independent interest protected under law, untethered to the right of privacy"). Instead, in the *Cox* decision, the court recognized, for the first time, a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure that exists independent of the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, "information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm." *Id.* In applying this new standard, the court noted "deference must be afforded" law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, "vague assertions of risk will not carry the day." *Id.* at 119. You argue release of the submitted information "would likely cause an imminent threat of physical danger." Upon review, we conclude you have established that release of a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, could result in physical danger to the individual to whom the information relates. With regard to the remaining submitted information, however, we find you have not established that a risk of harm would result from the disclosure of this information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

Section 552.102 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwanted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand you assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is noted above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*), the Third Court of Appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts*, 354 S.W.3d at 342 (Tex. 2010). The Supreme Court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 346. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.115 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] birth or death record maintained by the bureau of vital statistics of the Texas Department of Health or a local registration official[.]" Gov't Code § 552.115(a). Section 552.115 is applicable only to

information maintained by the bureau of vital statistics or local registration official. *See* Open Records Decision No. 338 (1982). In this instance, the city maintains the birth certificate contained in the submitted information. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold the submitted birth certificate under section 552.115 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). We also note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117.<sup>2</sup> Upon review, we find the city must withhold the named officers' personal information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, including the officers' cellular telephone numbers if they pay for the cellular telephone services with their personal funds.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.1175 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

...

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

---

<sup>2</sup>*See* Gov't Code § 552.117; Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed *at home*) (citing House Committee on State Affairs, Bill Analysis, H.B. 1976, 69th Leg. (1985); Senate Committee on State Affairs, Bill Analysis, H.B. 1976, 69th Leg. (1985)) (emphasis added).

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(1), (b). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 if the individuals to whom the information pertains are currently licensed peace officers and elect to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b). If the individuals are not licensed peace officers or no election is made, the city may not withhold the individuals' information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, title, or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country, is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides "[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(b). An access device number is one that may be used to 1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value, or 2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument, and includes an account number. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136 of the Government Code. ORD 684 at 9. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the owner of the e-mail address consents to its release or the e-mail address falls within the scope of section 552.137(c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked do not appear to be a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners of the e-mail addresses consent to their release.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code and federal law, sections 1701.306 and 159.002 of the Occupations Code, common-law privacy, and the common-law physical safety exception. The city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.102(a), 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government

Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, including the officers' cellular telephone numbers if they pay for the cellular telephone services with their personal funds. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if the individuals to whom the information pertains are currently licensed peace officers and elect to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b). The city must release the remaining information.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold any information found to be confidential in this ruling. *See id.* § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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 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,



Jeffrey W. Giles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWG/dls

Ref: ID# 486189

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)