



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 13, 2014

Mr. Stephen G. Schulz
Counsel for the City of Jamaica Beach
Greer, Herz & Adams, L.L.P.
One Moody Plaza, 18th Floor
Galveston, Texas 77550-7998

OR2014-20680

Dear Mr. Schulz:

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# 542864 (PIR# 19,748).

The City of Jamaica Beach City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file of a named city police officer and e-mails pertaining to a named individual. You state the city does not have any information responsive to the request for e-mails pertaining to a named individual.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the privacy interests of the named officer. Accordingly, you also state the city has notified the named officer of the request and his right to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.² See Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

²We have not received comments from the named officer.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a police 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 the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to the officer 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 TCOLE number in the submitted information does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the TCOLE number in the submitted information is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

Next, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the date the request was received or does not pertain to the personnel file of the named officer. The city need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that 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."³ *Id.* § 552.101. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.192 of the Government Code, which governs the release of information maintained by the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") concerning the licensure of an individual to carry a concealed handgun. Section 411.192 provides in relevant part:

(a) [DPS] shall disclose to a criminal justice agency information contained in its files and records regarding whether a named individual or any individual named in a specified list is licensed under this subchapter. Information on an individual subject to disclosure under this section includes the individual's name, date of birth, gender, race, zip code, telephone number, e-mail address, and Internet website address. Except as otherwise provided by this section and by Section 411.193, all other records maintained under this subchapter are confidential and are not subject to mandatory disclosure under the open records law, Chapter 552.

³The 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).

(b) An applicant or license holder may be furnished a copy of disclosable records regarding the applicant or license holder on request and the payment of a reasonable fee.

Id. § 411.192(a)-(b). The information we have marked consists of concealed handgun license information obtained from DPS. In this instance, the requestor is neither the license holder nor a criminal justice agency. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, this office has 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. United States 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 that 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. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082 (2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). 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, 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 information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

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). 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). 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 excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a peace officer, as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2); Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). We note section 552.117(a)(2) encompasses a peace officer’s personal cellular telephone and pager numbers if the officer personally pays for the cellular or pager service. *See* Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1998) (Gov’t Code § 552.117 not applicable to cellular mobile telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2); however, the city may only withhold the marked personal cellular numbers under section 552.117(a)(2) if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information consists of personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail address affirmatively consent to their disclosure.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).


Section 552.139 of the Government code provides, in part, “a photocopy or other copy of an identification badge issued to an official or employee of a governmental body” is confidential. *Id.* § 552.139(b)(3). Therefore, the city must withhold the photocopies of the officer’s identification card we have marked under section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code.

In summary, the TCOLE number in the submitted information 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 (1) section 411.192 of the Government Code and (2) common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. 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 the marked personal cellular numbers under section 552.117(a)(2) if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail address affirmatively consent to their disclosure. The city must withhold the photocopies of the officer’s identification card we have marked under section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code. The remaining responsive information must be released.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 542864

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)