



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 1, 2008

Mr. Paul F. Wieneskie
Attorney at Law
204 South Mesquite
Arlington, Texas 76010

OR2008-08865

Dear Mr. Wieneskie:

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# 314835.

The City of Euless (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for 21 categories of information related to a specified citation and a named police officer. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.114, 552.115, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.119, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that you have redacted portions of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .301(e)(1)(D). We note that 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.

However, you do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, that you have been authorized to withhold any of the remaining redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision 673 (2000). As such, these types of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling.

Next, you assert that the submitted information includes the police officer's high school and college transcripts. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.¹ Consequently, education records that are responsive to a request for information under the Act should not be submitted to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information").

We note that the city is not an educational agency or institution for purposes of FERPA. In this instance, however, it appears that the city may have obtained the police officer's transcripts from the educational institutions that created those documents. FERPA contains provisions that govern access to education records that were transferred by an educational agency or institution to a third party. To the extent that the transcripts were obtained from the educational institutions, so as to be governed by FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the transcripts, because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions have been made under FERPA. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authorities from which education records were obtained.² Thus, the city should contact any educational institutions from which the transcripts were obtained, as well as the DOE, regarding the applicability of FERPA to the transcripts. To the extent that the transcripts are not governed by FERPA, we will address your remaining arguments against their disclosure.

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og_resources.shtml.

²Accordingly, we also do not address your arguments under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA).

Next, we note that the submitted information includes documents that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part:

(a) the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains completed reports, evaluations, and investigations made for and by city, which are expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). Although you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note that this exception to disclosure is a discretionary exception under the Act that does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.³ Thus, city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We note, however, that the documents subject to section 552.022 contain information that is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. Therefore, we address your arguments under these exceptions.

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. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. The information at issue includes ST-3 accident report forms that were completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code states that except as provided by subsection (c), accident reports are privileged and confidential. Section 550.065(c)(4) provides for the 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. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, the Texas Department of Transportation or another governmental entity is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the agency with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In the situation at hand, the requestor has not provided the city with two of the three pieces of information. Thus, you must withhold the

³Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or which implicates the interests of third parties. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Discretionary exceptions, therefore, do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

accident reports, which we have marked, under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which governs the public availability of mental health records. Section 611.002 provides in part:

(a) 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.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code provide for access to information that is made confidential by section 611.002 only by certain individuals. *See id.* §§ 611.004, 611.0045; Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). We have marked mental health records that the city must withhold under section 611.002, unless the requestor is authorized to obtain that information under sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. *Id.* at 683. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information regarding a peace officer regardless of whether the officer elected under section 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code to keep such information confidential.⁴ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). We note that a post office box number is not a “home address”

⁴“Peace officer” is defined by article 2.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

for purposes of section 552.117.⁵ We have marked information in the section 552.022 documents that must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.⁶

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] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state." *Id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked in the section 552.022 documents pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We now address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.103 provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex.App.-Austin 2002, no pet.); *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex.App.-Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post*

⁵See Gov't Code § 552.117; Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that 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).

⁶We note that in Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001), the attorney general determined that all governmental bodies may withhold information that reveals a peace officer's home address, home telephone number, personal cellular phone number, personal pager number, social security number, and information that reveals whether the individual has family members without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to whether the exception under section 552.117(a)(2) applies.

Co., 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex.App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state that the named police officer arrested the requestor on March 26, 2008. You inform us that this arrest resulted in charges of reckless driving and a Class C traffic offense. We understand that the city is a party to this criminal litigation and that the litigation was pending in the respective criminal courts prior to the instant request for information. Based upon your representations and our review of the remaining information, we find that you have demonstrated that the city was a party to pending litigation on the date of its receipt of this request for information. Furthermore, we find that you have demonstrated that the remaining information is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, section 552.103 is generally applicable to the remaining information.⁷

We note, however, that once the opposing party in the anticipated litigation has seen or had access to information that is related to litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, the information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. In this instance, the opposing party to the pending litigation has already had access to the specified citation. Therefore, the citation, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 and must be released to the requestor.⁸ Furthermore, to the extent the opposing party had seen or had access to any portion of the remaining information, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.103. However, to the extent the opposing party has not seen or had access to the remaining information, it may be withheld under section 552.103. We note, however, that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must withhold the ST-3 reports pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. The mental health records we have marked may only be released in accordance with sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

⁸We note that specified citation contains information that is confidential and not subject to release to the general public. However, the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to the information. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). Because such information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city should again seek our decision.

information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, section 552.117(a)(2), and section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) must be released. To the extent the opposing party has not seen or had access to the remaining information, it may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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.

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 cursive script that reads "Jordan Hale".

Jordan Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JH/mcf

Ref: ID# 314835

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. M. Aram Azadpour
P.O. Box 2644
Grapevine, Texas 76099
(w/o enclosures)