



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 16, 2013

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

OR2013-21813

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# 508539 (CAO File No. 13PIA0356).

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

Initially, we note the requestor specifically excludes home addresses, home telephone numbers, social security numbers, driver's license numbers, and license plate numbers from his request. Therefore, those types of information are not responsive to the present request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the sheriff's office need not release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note portions of the submitted information are 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:

(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 responsive information contains completed evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5, 470 at 7 (1987) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.111 deliberative process). Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111. You also seek to withhold the information at issue under section 552.108 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 of the Government Code for the completed evaluations subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Additionally, because sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.1175 make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information subject to section 552.022 and the remaining information. We will also consider your arguments under sections 552.108 and 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code 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[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Upon review of your arguments, we find you have failed to demonstrate how release of the responsive information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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. Section 552.111 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. ORD 615 at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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).

We note the information at issue consists of the personnel files of the named deputies. Upon review, we find you have not established the information at issue pertains to policymaking matters of the sheriff's office for purposes of section 552.111. Accordingly, we find none of the information at issue may be withheld on this basis.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Section 6103(a) renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as "a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments or tax payments, . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, . . . or offense[.]" *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Thus, we find

the sheriff's office must withhold the submitted W-4 form we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. Section 1324a governs I-9 forms and their related documents. This section provides an I-9 form and "any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter" and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the submitted I-9 form and its attachments in this instance would be "for purposes other than enforcement" of the referenced federal statutes. Accordingly, we conclude the sheriff's office must withhold the submitted I-9 form and its attachments, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrines of constitutional and common-law 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 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

Common-law privacy 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). 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

This office has also found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Whether the public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373. However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to applicants and employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance, especially where the applicant was seeking a position in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 470 at 4 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>3</sup> However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining responsive information falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual's privacy interests for the purposes of constitutional privacy. We also find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining responsive information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. We therefore conclude the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with either constitutional or common-law 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). *Garrity* dealt with the constitutional prohibition against self-incrimination in court or other judicial proceedings.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

*See* 385 U.S. at 493. Thus, *Garrity* is not applicable here because the remaining responsive 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 responsive 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 as 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 Third 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 expressly disagreed with *Hubert*’s interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard 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 then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 346. Upon review, we conclude the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a). The remaining responsive information is not excepted under section 552.102(a) and may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code. 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. We note section 552.117 also applies to a personal cellular telephone number as long as the cellular service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506* at 5-6 (1988). Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the sheriff’s office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. However, you have failed to establish section 552.117(a)(2) is applicable to any of the remaining information, and the sheriff’s office may not withhold it on that basis.

You also raise section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Section 552.1175 protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov’t Code § 552.1175. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining responsive

information consists of the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, or family member information of one of types of individuals to whom section 552.1175 applies. As such, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information on this basis.

We note some of the remaining responsive information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a). We conclude the sheriff's office must withhold the responsive information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

In summary, the sheriff's office must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code: (1) the submitted W-4 form we have marked in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code; (2) the I-9 form and its attachments we have marked in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code; and (3) the information we have marked in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>6</sup> The sheriff's office must also withhold: (1) the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102 of the Government Code; (2) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the sheriff's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body; and (3) the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the remaining responsive 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.

---

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>5</sup>We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

<sup>6</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including W-4 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, an I-9 form under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code, and direct deposit authorization forms under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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](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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paige Lay".

Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/bhf

Ref: ID# 508539

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)