



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 3, 2014

Ms. Donna L. Johnson
Counsel for the Hempstead Police Department
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2014-11507

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 528669 (Ref: COH14-001).

The City of Hempstead (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named city police officer. You state you are releasing some of the requested information to the requestor. You state the city will withhold social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.122, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code.² The city also inform us it has notified the officer at issue of the city's receipt of the request for information and of the officer's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why

¹We 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).

²Although you do not raise sections 552.117 and 552.136 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise it based on your markings.

information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a peace officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand an officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in the commissioner's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Accordingly, we find the officer's TCOLE identification number in the submitted information does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the TCOLE identification number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

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 the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part the following:

(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.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). 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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes medical records subject to the MPA. Thus, the city must withhold these records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in accordance with the MPA.³ We note the remaining information includes the results of a drug test. Section 159.001 of the MPA

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

defines “patient” as “a person who, to receive medical care, consults with or is seen by a physician.” Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Because the individual at issue in the report did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug test, this individual is not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. Additionally, we find none of the remaining information constitutes a medical record subject to the MPA, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may not be made available to the requestor except in accordance with federal regulations. *See ORD* 565. Furthermore, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one’s current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *Id.* § 411.082(2)(B). Accordingly, the city must withhold the confidential CHRI we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and chapter 411 of the Government Code.⁴ However, none of the remaining information consists of CHRI, and none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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 a compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Cf. *U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (1992) (employee's 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 (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 (1987) (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, however, none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and a matter of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law 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." 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 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102, and none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

We understand you will redact the information you have marked subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code in conjunction with Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).⁵ Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from public disclosure the home addresses, home telephone numbers, 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 section 552.024 of the Government Code or section 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁶ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). We note an individual's personal post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117 and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.117. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 6 (1994) (purpose of section 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied). Upon review, we find some of the information you have marked is not subject to section 552.117(a)(2) and may not be withheld on that basis. Therefore, except for the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.122(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure test items developed by a licensing agency or governmental body. Gov't Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated, but does not encompass evaluations of an employee's overall job performance or suitability. Whether information falls within the section 552.122 exception must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 626 at 6. This office has applied section 552.122 where release of "test items" might compromise the effectiveness of future

⁵Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies to withhold the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

⁶"Peace officer" is defined by Article 2.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

examinations. *See id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976). You seek to withhold the some of the remaining information under section 552.122. You generally state the information at issue consists of test items. However, you have not explained how the information at issue tests any specific knowledge of an applicant or might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes a test item for purposes of section 552.122. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.122 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 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. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.⁷ Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information consist of motor vehicle record information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding 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). An access device number is one that may be used to 1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value, or 2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by a paper instrument, and includes an account number. *Id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information you have marked consists of an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

You note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

⁷Section 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).

In summary, the TCOLE identification number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA and in conjunction with federal law and chapter 411 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Except for the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information that is subject to the Act must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/bhf

Ref: ID# 528669

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)