



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 14, 2014

Ms. Erin A. Higginbotham
Counsel for the City of Copperas Cove
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal, Hyde & Zech, P.C
2500 West William Cannon Drive, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745

OR2014-14249

Dear Ms. Higginbotham:

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# 532768.

The City of Copperas Cove (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You state the city will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, 552.1175, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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

¹Section 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* 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 id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

In this instance, although we agree some of the information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*, we note this information pertains to the requestor. Section 552.023 of the Government Code gives a person a special right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests. See generally Gov't Code § 552.023; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Therefore, the requestor has a special right of access to her identifying information, and the city may not withhold her information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

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." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court has considered the applicability of section 552.102, and has 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, 348 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the dates of birth you have highlighted under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See *id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 52526 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). The submitted information pertains to an internal investigation regarding the city's Animal Control Department (the "department"). You have not explained how the department's administrative investigation pertains to any criminal matter. Consequently, we find you have failed to show the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) to this information, and the city may not withhold it on that ground.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a). Whether information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. You state the employees at issue timely made a request for confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have highlighted under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states "[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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the Drug Enforcement Administration registration numbers you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, none of the remaining information consists of access device numbers for the purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

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 member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).³ *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

³The 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).

In summary, the city must withhold the dates of birth you have highlighted under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have highlighted under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the Drug Enforcement Administration registration numbers you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

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

Sincerely,



Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 532768

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note some of the information being released contains confidential information to which the requestor has a right of access.