



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 1, 2013

Ms. Cheryl Elliott Thornton
Assistant County Attorney
County of Harris
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2013-17010

Dear Ms. Thornton:

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# 500778 (CAO File No. 13PIA0363).

The Harris County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for the complete personnel file of a named sheriff's deputy. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (17). The submitted information includes completed evaluations that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1), which must be released unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information also contains a court-filed document that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(17), which must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You further seek to withhold the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1), which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. Further, the submitted court-filed document may not be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.108, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 for the information at issue. Further, as section 552.117 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of section 552.117 for the information subject to section 552.022. We will also consider your arguments under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111, as well as your remaining claimed exceptions, for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

First, you claim the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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 section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

In this instance, you generally state, "To the extent that the records requested are records commensurate to a contested case which fall under the Administrative Procedure Act [(the "APA")], the Governmental Code [sic] chapter 2001 [] defines these actions as 'litigation'." *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constituted litigation

for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). You further state, "[P]ursuant to the test, information commensurate to the internal affairs investigation and proceedings are adversarial and, therefore, fall within the scope of 'litigation'." Thus, we understand you to indicate the information at issue may relate to an internal affairs investigation or to a proceeding under the APA. However, you have failed to provide any arguments explaining how this information is related to any specific litigation that was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the sheriff's office's receipt of the request. Consequently, we find the sheriff's office may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, you assert the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime; [or]

(2) 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[.]

...

(b) An 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 is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution; [or]

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1)-(2), (b)(1)-(2). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must reasonably explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested

information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You generally state the information at issue “should be excepted from disclosure” under these subsections. However, you do not inform us the information at issue pertains to any specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained how its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). You state the information at issue “may . . . reveal law enforcement methods, techniques and strategies[.]” This is especially true when the conviction did not result in a conviction as with the case herein.” However, you have not explained how the information at issue pertains to any specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2). Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

You also assert the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” *Gov’t Code* § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2* (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2* (1990).

In *Open Records Decision No. 615*, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See ORD 615 at 5*. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3* (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You assert the information at issue should be protected under section 552.111 because you argue “the records requested clearly show the deliberative process as well as interagency and intra-agency discussion.” However, we note the information at issue pertains to personnel matters concerning only the named sheriff’s office deputy. You have not demonstrated how this information involves policymaking pertaining to personnel matters of a broad scope. Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 560.003 of the Government Code provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *Id.* § 560.003; see *id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the submitted fingerprints under section 560.002. See *id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the submitted fingerprints, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;

(3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;

(4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or

(5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

Occ. Code § 1703.306(a), (b). The submitted information contains information acquired from a polygraph examination. The requestor does not fall within any of the categories of individuals who have a right of access to the submitted polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the submitted polygraph information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information 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. 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). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). This office has found financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. *See* ORDs 600, 523. This office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in

fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 392 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing or the information is of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. 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)). After review of the remaining information at issue, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

You claim section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional doctrine embodied in *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493 (1967) for portions of the remaining information. *Garrity* dealt with the constitutional prohibition against self-incrimination in court or other judicial proceedings. *See* 385 U.S. at 493. Thus, *Garrity* is not applicable here because the remaining information is subject to release in response to a request under the Act and not used as evidence in a criminal prosecution or other judicial proceeding. Therefore, we find this case provides no basis for withholding any portion of the remaining information.

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). We understand you to assert the privacy

analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it exempts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we have marked information that must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.²

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Section 552.1175 provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

²We note a governmental body may withhold a peace officer's home address and telephone number, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security number, and family member information under section 552.117(a)(2) without requesting a decision from this office. *See Open Records Decision No. 670* (2001); *Gov't Code* § 552.147(b).

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Id. § 552.1175(a)(1); Act of May 26, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., H.B. 1632, § 3 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.1175(b)). Some of the remaining information, which we have marked, relates to peace officers of the sheriff's office but the information is not held by the sheriff's office in an employment capacity, or relates to peace officers who are employed by other law enforcement agencies. Accordingly, to the extent the peace officers whose information is at issue elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked pertaining to that peace officer under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Conversely, if any of the peace officers at issue do not elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information pertaining to that peace officer may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁴

In summary, the sheriff's office must withhold (1) the marked fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code; (2) the marked polygraph information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code; (3) the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (4) the information we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code; (5) the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; (6) the information we marked under section 552.1175 of the

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).

⁴We note, effective May 18, 2013, the Texas legislature amended section 552.130 of the Government Code to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a)(2) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.130(c)). Thus, a governmental body may begin redacting vehicle identification numbers and license plate information with respect to requests for information received by the governmental body on or after May 18, 2013. However, if a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(d), (e).

Government Code, to the extent the peace officers whose information is at issue elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code; and (7) the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the remaining information.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 500778

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)