



June 1, 2001

Ms. J. Middlebrooks
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
2014 Main, Room 501
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2001-2270

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 147925.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for copies of all personnel records for a specified former department police officer. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the representative samples of information that you submitted to us for review.¹

Initially, you claim that the submitted records contain an accident report form protected from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 47(b)(1) of article 6701d, V.T.C.S.² See Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). The Seventy-fourth Legislature amended section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S. to provide for release of accident reports to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) date of the accident; (2) name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) specific location of the accident. See Act of May 27, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 894, § 1, 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 4413. Further, the Seventy-fourth Legislature also repealed and

¹ We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

² Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes.

codified article 6701d as section 550.065 of the Transportation Code without substantive change. *See* Act of May 1, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 165, §§ 24, 25, 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 1025, 1870-71.³ In section 13 of Senate Bill 1069, the Seventy-fifth Legislature amended section 550.065 of the Transportation Code to provide for release of accident reports under specific circumstances. *See* Act of May 29, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S., ch. 1187, § 13, 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 4575, 4582-83 (current version at Transp. Code § 550.065). The Seventy-fifth Legislature also repealed section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S. in section 16 of Senate Bill 1069. *See id.* § 16(b), 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 4575, 4583. However, a Travis County district court has issued a permanent injunction enjoining the enforcement of the amendment to section 550.065 of the Transportation Code enacted by section 13 of Senate Bill 1069. *See Texas Daily Newspaper Ass'n v. Cornyn*, No. 97-08930 (345th Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex., April 26, 2000). The district court has declared that the law in effect prior to the passage of Senate Bill 1069 now governs and remains unaffected by the permanent injunction. We have determined that the law in effect prior to the passage of Senate Bill 1069 was section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S.⁴

Section 47(b)(1) of article 6701d provides that:

The Department or a law enforcement agency employing a peace officer who made an accident report is required to release a copy of the report on request to:

....

(D) a person who provides the Department or the law enforcement agency with two or more of the following:

(i) the date of the accident;

³ Because the repeal of a statute by a code does not affect an amendment of the statute by the same legislature which enacted the code, the amendment of section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S. is preserved and given effect as part of the code provision. *See* Gov't Code § 311.031(c). In 1997, the Seventy-fifth Legislature enacted Senate Bill 898 and amended section 550.065 of the Transportation Code to conform to section 47 of article 6701d as enacted by the Seventy-fourth Legislature and repealed article 6701d. *See* Act of May 8, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S., ch. 165, § 30.125, 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 327, 648-49.

⁴ Although the Seventy-fifth Legislature enacted Senate Bill 898 prior to the passage of Senate Bill 1069, Senate Bill 898 was not effective until September 1, 1997. *See* Act of May 8, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S., ch. 165, § 33.01, 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 327, 712. Further, Senate Bill 1069 expressly provides that to the extent of any conflict, Senate Bill 1069 prevails over another Act of the Seventy-fifth Legislature. *See* Act of May 29, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S., ch. 1187, § 16(c), 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 4575, 4583. If irreconcilable amendments are enacted at the same session of the legislature, the latest in date prevails. *See* Gov't Code § 311.025(b). Because Senate Bill 898 was never effective and later amendments prevail, we conclude that section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S. was the law in effect prior to the passage of Senate Bill 1069 regarding the availability of accident report information rather than section 550.065 as amended by Senate Bill 898.

(ii) the name of any person involved in the accident; or

(iii) the specific location of the accident[.]

V.T.C.S. art. 6701d, § 47(b)(1). *See* Act of May 27, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 894, § 1, 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 4413.⁵ Under this provision, a law enforcement agency employing a peace officer who made an accident report “is required to release” a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the law enforcement agency with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *See id.* In this instance, the requestor has not provided the department with the two required statutory pieces of information. Therefore, the accident report must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 47(b)(1) of article 6701d, V.T.C.S.

You state that portions of the requested documents containing criminal history record information (“CHRI”) are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101. Federal regulations prohibit the release of CHRI maintained in state and local CHRI systems to the general public. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) (“Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given.”), (2) (“No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself.”). Section 411.083 provides that any CHRI maintained by the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) is confidential. Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). Similarly, CHRI obtained from the DPS pursuant to statute is also confidential and may only be disclosed in very limited instances. *Id.* § 411.084; *see also id.* § 411.087 (restrictions on disclosure of CHRI obtained from DPS also apply to CHRI obtained from other criminal justice agencies). Therefore, any CHRI obtained from DPS or another criminal justice agency must not be released to the requestor.

You also claim that some of the submitted documents are medical records that are protected from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. The MPA provides that “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.” Occupations Code § 159.002(b). A “physician” is defined under the MPA as “a person licensed to practice medicine in this state.” *Id.* at § 151.002(12). We agree that some of the documents you seek to withhold are medical records and may only be disclosed in accordance with the access provisions of the MPA. However, it does not appear that the other records you seek to withhold under this statute were “created or maintained by

⁵ We note that the text of amended section 47 of article 6701d is not found in Vernon’s Revised Civil Statutes or in the Transportation Code. However, section 47 of article 6701d is published in the 1995 General and Special Laws of the 1995 Legislature at chapter 894, section 1.

a physician.” Therefore, you may not withhold these records from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA. We have marked the documents accordingly.

You also claim that you have submitted mental health records that are protected from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. Chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code provides for the confidentiality of records created or maintained by a mental health professional. Section 611.002(a) provides:

Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002. Section 611.001 defines a “professional” as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See* Health and Safety Code § 611.001. Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only for certain individuals. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). We have marked the mental health record that may only be disclosed as provided by the access provisions of sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code.

You also contend that the former officer’s personal financial information is protected from disclosure by the common law right of privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses the common law right of privacy. Information is protected by the common law right of privacy when (1) it is highly intimate and 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 Industrial Foundation v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), *cert denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992). Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common law privacy, but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 373 (1983). For example, a public employee’s allocation of his salary to a voluntary investment program or to optional insurance coverage which is offered by his employer is a personal investment decision and information about it is excepted from disclosure under the common law right of privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990). Likewise, an employee’s designation of a retirement beneficiary is excepted from disclosure under the common law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). However, information revealing that an employee participates in a group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by the governmental body is not excepted from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 10 (1992). After examining the submitted information, we conclude that some financial information

relates to the former police officer's participation in group insurance plans which are funded partly or wholly by the department and must, therefore, be released. However, we conclude that the marked financial information is confidential under the common law right of privacy and is, thus, excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You claim that the documents contain information that is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(2) excepts from disclosure a peace officer's home address, home telephone number, social security number, and information indicating whether the peace officer has family members regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We have marked the information that is protected under section 552.117(2) of the Government Code.

Finally, you claim that the submitted driver's license numbers must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130(a) 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 a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. We have marked the driver's license numbers that must be withheld under section 552.130(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, you must withhold the accident report from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 47(b)(1) of article 6701d, V.T.C.S. You must withhold from disclosure any criminal history information under section 552.101. You must withhold from disclosure the marked medical records pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA. You must withhold from disclosure the marked mental health record pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with Chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. You must withhold from disclosure the marked financial information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common law right of privacy. You must withhold from disclosure the marked section 552.117 information contained within the submitted documents. You must withhold from disclosure the marked driver's license numbers pursuant to section 552.130(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full

benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



June B. Harden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JBH/RJB/seg

Ref: ID# 147925

Encl. Marked documents

cc: Mr. Timothy O'Hara
905 6th Avenue West
Bradenton, Florida 34205
(w/o enclosures)