



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 5, 2013

Ms. Janet R. Cassels
For the City of Alto
Cassels & Reynolds, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1626
Lufkin, Texas 75902-1626

OR2013-13509

Dear Ms. 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# 495260.

The City of Alto (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for personnel information pertaining to three named officers. You state the city is making some of the requested information available to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.130, 552.137, and 552.140 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note the city did not raise section 552.140 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure within ten business days of the date the city received the request. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(b), .302. However, because section 552.140 is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to withhold information from disclosure, we will address the applicability of this exception to the submitted information, notwithstanding the city's violation of section 552.301(b) in raising this exception. *See id.* § 552.302. Although you raise section 552.024 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, we note this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Rather, this section permits a current or former official or employee of a governmental body to choose whether to allow public access to certain information relating to the current or former official or employee that is held by the employing governmental body. *See id.* § 552.024. Further, although you raise section 552.1175 of the Government Code, we note section 552.117 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise for information the city holds in its capacity as an employer. Accordingly, we do not address your argument under section 552.1175. Finally, although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 552.130 and 552.137 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the request because it does not pertain to any of the three officers named in the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in part, as follows:

(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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). We note some of the submitted documents, which we have marked, relate to an investigation of alleged child neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(4) (defining “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find portions of the information are subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. You do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the information we have marked is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not consider your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

(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.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes confidential medical records. Accordingly, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. Some of the remaining information you seek to withhold consists of reports of the results of drug tests. We note section 159.001 of the MPA defines "patient" as "a person who, to receive medical care, consults with or is seen by a physician." *Id.* § 159.001(3). Because the individual at issue in the reports did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug tests, this individual is not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining responsive information consists of a communication between a physician and a patient; records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient; or information obtained from such communications or records. *See id.* § 159.002(a)-(c). Therefore, the city may not withhold the any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of the MPA.

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 and L-3 declaration forms we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information (“CHRI”) confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. 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 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* at 10-12. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for criminal justice purposes. *See id.* § 411.089(b)(1). We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one’s current involvement in the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *See id.* § 411.082(2)(B). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes confidential CHRI. This information must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining responsive information constitutes CHRI. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information at issue under section 552.101 on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 560 of the Government Code, which provides that “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body

is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *See id.* §§ 560.001 (defining “biometric identifier” to include fingerprints), .002 (prescribing manner in which biometric identifiers must be maintained and circumstances in which they can be released), .003 (biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body exempt from disclosure under the Act). We have marked fingerprints in the remaining information. You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint information in this instance. Therefore, the city must withhold the fingerprints we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code, which provides that an Employment Eligibility Verification Form I-9 “may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter” and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Further, prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). The city seeks to withhold a Form I-9 and W-4 forms; however, upon review, we find the submitted information does not contain a Form I-9 or W-4 forms.³

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 held common-law privacy protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. This office has also found 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 Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Additionally, this office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between 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 (employment applicant’s salary information not

³We note this decision is applicable only to the information submitted to this office by the city. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D).

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 (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 (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁴ However, we find the remaining responsive information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate concern to the public. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses constitutional privacy, which 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. Open Records Decision No. 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 scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; 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)). You claim the remaining information is protected by constitutional privacy. Upon review, however, we find you have not demonstrated how any of this information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.140 of the Government Code provides a military veteran's DD-214 form or other military discharge record that is first recorded with, or that otherwise first comes into the possession of, a governmental body on or after September 1, 2003, is confidential for a period of seventy-five years and may only be disclosed in accordance with section 552.140 or in accordance with a court order. *See* Gov't Code § 552.140(a)-(b). We have marked DD-214 forms. You do not inform us when the city came into possession of these forms.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Therefore, we must rule conditionally. If the city came into possession of the forms we marked on or after September 1, 2003, the city must withhold them under section 552.140 of the Government Code. If the city received the forms before September 1, 2003, then the city may not withhold it pursuant to section 552.140 of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]”⁵ *Id.* § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court 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. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Having carefully reviewed the remaining information, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.102(a).

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See 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 an individual’s post office box number is not a “home address” for purposes of section 552.117, and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.117.⁶ Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *Id.* § 552.130(a)(1). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁷

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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);

⁵The 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁶*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).

⁷We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1* (to be codified as an amendment to Gov’t Code § 552.130(c)). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See Gov’t Code* § 552.130(d), (e).

see id. § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states that “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act],” unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find none of the remaining responsive information consists of e-mail addresses. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

The remaining information contains a photocopy of an officer’s identification card. Section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code provides, “a photocopy or other copy of an identification badge issued to an official or employee of a governmental body” is confidential. *Id.* § 552.139(b)(3). Therefore, the city must withhold the photocopy of the identification card that we have marked under section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with (1) section 261.201 of the Family Code, (2) the MPA, (3) section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, (4) section 411.083 of the Government Code, (5) section 560.003 of the Government Code, and (6) common-law privacy. If the city came into possession of the DD-214 forms we marked on or after September 1, 2003, the city must withhold them under section 552.140 of the Government Code.⁸ The city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.102(a), 552.117(a)(2), 552.130, 552.136 and 552.139 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

⁸Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, 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 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey W. Giles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and "G".

Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWG/dls

Ref: ID# 495260

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)