ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2007

Mr. Michael Valdez
Assistant District Attorney
9th Judicial District
207 West Phillips, 2nd Floor
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2007-15092

Dear Mr. Valdez:

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# 296311.

The Montgomery County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received a request for a copy of a specific case file. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.[1]

Section 552.101 protects from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. For information to be protected from public disclosure under common-law privacy, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Common-law privacy protects information when (1) it contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly

[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.

objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the public has no legitimate interest in the disclosure of the information. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 683.

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. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). 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)).

The submitted documents contain information that is considered highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate concern to the public. Here, although you seek to withhold the submitted information in its entirety, you have not demonstrated, nor does the submitted information reflect, a situation in which the entire report must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. None of the remaining submitted information is protected under common-law or constitutional privacy.

Additionally, the submitted documents contain fingerprint information. Chapter 560 of the Government Code provides that a governmental body may not release fingerprint information except in certain limited circumstances. *See* Gov't Code §§ 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 (providing that biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body are exempt from disclosure under Act). The district attorney does not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, that section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the fingerprint information at issue. Therefore, the district attorney must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district attorney must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district attorney must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101

of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.[2]

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.

---

[2]We note that the submitted information contains a social security number. 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,



Jessica J. Maloney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJM/jh

Ref: ID# 296311

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steven J. Lieberman
Attorney at Law
JP Morgan Chase Building
712 Main Street, 31st Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)