



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 5, 2007

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2007-03855

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 275021.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received requests from two requestors for information relating to an application to operate a sexually-oriented business. You indicate that some of the requested information has been released. You claim that other responsive information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the information you submitted.

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. You contend that some of the submitted information is confidential under the decision in *N.W. Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Houston*, 352 F.3d 162 (5th Cir. 2003). The question in *N.W. Enterprises* was the constitutionality of an ordinance of the City of Houston that regulated sexually-oriented businesses and specified the personal information required of individuals applying for permits to work as managers or entertainers in such businesses. With regard to the required public disclosure under the Act of certain information provided by entertainers and managers in their permit applications, the district court in *N.W. Enterprises* concluded that

there is meaningful potential danger to individuals working in sexually oriented businesses if the information in their permit applications is disclosed to the public. The Court concludes further that the potential for disclosure is likely to have a chilling effect on the applicants' protected speech. These dangerous and chilling effects are sufficiently severe that the information should be held confidential by the city.

N.W. Enter., Inc. v. City of Houston, 27 F.Supp.2d 754, 843 (S.D. Tex.1998). In upholding the confidentiality determination of the district court, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit stated that “[b]ecause the district court declared the information on entertainer and manager permit applications confidential under the [Act], the City cannot disclose it to the public.” *N.W. Enter.*, 352 F.3d at 195. The appellate court also agreed that the entertainers' and managers' home addresses and telephone numbers were confidential. *Id.* Thus, pursuant to *N.W. Enterprises*, information revealing the identity of an entertainer or manager of a sexually-oriented business, including the entertainer or manager's home address and telephone number, is generally confidential. Some of the submitted information consists of the types of information protected in *N.W. Enterprises*. The city must withhold that identifying information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with the court's holding in *N.W. Enterprises*. However, *N.W. Enterprises* did not address the confidentiality of any of the remaining information, including the names of business owners and business names, addresses and telephone numbers. Therefore, those types of information are not confidential under the decision in *N.W. Enterprises* and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

You also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common law privacy, both elements of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. In this instance, the remaining documents do not contain a compilation of information that depicts any individual as a suspect, arrested person, or criminal defendant. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. The public availability of fingerprints is governed by sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 of the Government Code. Section 560.001 defines “biometric identifier,” for the purposes of these sections, as meaning “a retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry.” Gov’t Code § 560.001(1). Section 560.002 provides that a governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual:

(1) may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless:

(A) the individual consents to the disclosure;

(B) the disclosure is required or permitted by a federal statute or by a state statute other than [the Act]; or

(C) the disclosure is made by or to a law enforcement agency for a law enforcement purpose; and

(2) shall store, transmit, and protect from disclosure the biometric identifier using reasonable care and in a manner that is the same as or more protective than the manner in which the governmental body stores, transmits, and protects its other confidential information.

Id. § 560.002. Section 560.003 provides that “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *Id.* § 560.003. As there is no indication that either of the requestors would have a right of access under section 560.002 to the fingerprints that we have marked, that information is confidential under section 560.003 and must also be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You also raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, which protects certain specific types of law enforcement information. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). Section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable if the release of the information would interfere with a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App. – Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.108(b)(1) protects internal records of a law enforcement agency, the release of which would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App. – Austin 2002, no pet.) (Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.108(b)(2) excepts “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(b)(2). Sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) are applicable only if the information at issue relates to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or a deferred adjudication.

A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Therefore, because you have not explained how or why this exception is applicable to any of the remaining information, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108.

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. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130(a)(1). The city must withhold the Texas driver's license information that we have marked under section 552.130.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states in part that “[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); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). We have marked a bank account number that the city must withhold under section 552.136.

In summary: (1) that city must withhold the marked information that is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with *N.W. Enterprises*; (2) the city must withhold the marked fingerprints under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code; (3) the marked Texas driver's license information must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (4) the marked bank

account number must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released.¹

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

¹We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. 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 under the Act.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.W. Morris III", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with large loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/jb

Ref: ID# 275021

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Justin Michaels
News Channel 11
5600 Avenue A
Lubbock, Texas 79404
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Winn
Fox Talk 950
9800 University Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79410
(w/o enclosures)