ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 4, 2014

Ms. A. Feliz Abalos
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Odessa
P.O. Box 4398
Odessa, Texas 79760-4398

OR2014-09521

Dear Ms. Abalos:

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# 524856.

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified police officer, including complaints or information pertaining to complaints filed against the specified officer, as well as e-mail messages sent and received by the specified officer using city e-mail.[1] You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 protected by other statutes, such as

[1]You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S. W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

chapter 550 of the Transportation Code.[2] *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) states, except as provided by subsection (c) or subsection (e), accident reports are privileged and confidential. Section 550.065(c)(4) provides for 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 Department of Public Safety 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. The submitted information contains a CR-3 Texas Peace Officer's Crash Report. In this instance, the requestor has not provided the city with two of the three pieces of required information pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted CR-3 report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation 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).

Further, in *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Id.* at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, but the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, common-law privacy does not

---

[2]The 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).

protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. As such, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information does not pertain to a sexual harassment investigation so as to fall under the holding in *Ellen*, nor is it highly intimate or embarrassing or not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.

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[.]"[3] Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). 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). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated how releasing the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Further, we find the city has not demonstrated how the information at issue is not purely administrative in nature. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue 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. 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).

---

[3]Although you cite generally to section 552.108 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise section 552.108(b)(l) based on the content of your argument.

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 state some of the submitted information contains intra-agency communications that consist of advice, analysis, opinions, or recommendations pertaining to policy matters. However, upon review, we find the information at issue consists of general administrative or factual information, and pertains to a personnel matter. As such, we find you have not demonstrated how the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations of city staff pertaining to a policymaking matter of the city. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 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 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). To the extent the individuals whose information we have marked are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold a cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.

If the individuals whose information we have marked are current or former city employees, but are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, their personal information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts the same information discussed above for a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, if the individuals at issue are current or former city employees, but are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then to the extent they timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold a cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. If, however, the individuals at issue did not timely elect to keep their personal information confidential, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1).

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 excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Upon review, we find the e-mail address we have marked is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted CR-3 report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individuals whose information we have marked are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the individuals whose information we have marked are current or former city employees, but are no longer licensed peace officers

as defined by article 2.12, then to the extent they timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. In either event, the city may only withhold a cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.[4]

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,

Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 524856

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

---

[4]The information being released contains social security numbers. We note 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).