



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 14, 2014

Ms. Rachel L. Lindsay
Counsel for the City of Keene
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
704 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2014-06117

Dear Ms. Lindsay:

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# 519484.

The City of Keene (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests, from the same requestor, for the city police department's arrest policy and procedure from 2010 to the date of the request, all roll call meeting summaries from 2010 to the date of the request, and any and all personnel records for a named officer. You state you do not have information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ You state you will redact information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001) and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.²

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies that are subject to the Act to withhold home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone numbers, personal pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers without the necessity of requesting attorney general decision under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (delineating circumstances under which attorney general decision constitutes previous determination under section 552.301). 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. *Gov't Code* § 552.147(b).

You claim the submitted 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 reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note the requestor excludes from his requests social security numbers, home addresses, and home telephone numbers. Therefore, these portions of information are not responsive to the instant requests for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of nonresponsive information, and the city is not required to release nonresponsive information in response to these requests.⁴

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 protected by other statutes, such as section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which pertains to an L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition form and an L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health form required by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education ("TCLEOSE"). Section 1701.306 provides, in part:

(a) [TCLEOSE] may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a physical examination, blood test, or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCLEOSE]. A declaration is not public information.

³We 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.

⁴As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a), (b). Upon review, we find the L-2 and L-3 declaration forms in Exhibit C must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.⁵

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See id.* §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Some of the information at issue consists of reports of the results of drug tests. We note section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as “a person who, to receive medical care, consults with or is seen by a physician.” *Id.* § 159.001(3). Because the individual at issue in the reports did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug tests, this individual is not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. However, we find the information we have marked consists of a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created by a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of the MPA. However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to the MPA and none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

⁵We note the L-2 and L-3 declaration forms at issue were created prior to September 1, 2011. Although section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code was amended in 2011 by the 82nd Legislature, L-2 and L-3 declaration forms created prior to September 1, 2011 are subject to the former version of section 1701.306, which was continued in effect for that purpose.

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. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). However, we note, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). However, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to those who are involved in law enforcement. *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 law enforcement employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining responsive is highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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. *See* 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 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)). This office has previously determined the release of the score report of the Minnesota Multiphasic

Personality Inventory (the “MMPI”) implicates an individual’s constitutional right to privacy. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 6 (1992) (relying on *Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589 (1977), and *McKenna v. Fargo*, 451 F.Supp. 1355 (D.N.J. 1978)). We note the MMPI assumes certain components of the personality and scores people as to these traits on a numerical scale to enable comparison with established norms; a report of an individual’s MMPI scores therefore purports to reveal highly intimate information about the individual, including negative characteristics. *See* ORD 600 at 5 (MMPI scores may reveal, *inter alia*, the applicant’s tendency toward hysteria, hypochondria, or mood swings). The remaining responsive information contains scores from a personality test that reveals highly intimate details of the individual’s personality, including negative characteristics. Upon review, we find the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

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.”⁶ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court 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. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, the date of birth we have marked must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977)). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not

⁶The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You seek to withhold portions of Exhibit B under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. You state release of this information “would interfere with law enforcement” and “would place individuals who are in a confrontation with police at an advantage over the police.” Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit B under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, we find the city has not demonstrated the release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, none of the remaining information in Exhibit B may be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code 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. We have marked information of an individual who may be among the types of individuals listed in section 552.1175(a), and the information is not held by the city in an employment capacity. Thus, if the information we have marked relates to an individual to whom section 552.1175 applies and the individual elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.1175. If the individual at issue is not an individual to whom section 552.1175 applies or if no election is made, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is exempted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the driver’s license information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁷

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”).

⁷We 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).

Therefore, the city must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code: (1) Exhibit C in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code; (2) the information we have marked in conjunction with the MPA; (3) the information we have marked in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (4) the information we have marked in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code, if this information relates to an individual to whom section 552.1175 applies and the individual elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b). The city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The city 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,



Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 519484

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)