



January 28, 2015

Ms. Mary Ann Powell
Counsel for the City of Stafford
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
Wortham Tower
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2015-01649

Dear Ms. Powell:

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# 551648 (Reference No. COS14-075).

The City of Stafford (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for personnel file information for two former police officers. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You state the department will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code, and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You also indicate the department will

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). 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 id.* § 552.147(b).

withhold e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, 552.1175, and 552.139 of the Government Code.³ Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the privacy interests of the individuals named in the request for information. Accordingly, you notified these individuals of the request for information and of their right to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments to this office stating why information should or should to be released). We have received comments from an attorney for one of the named individuals. We have considered the submitted arguments 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." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). The information at issue consists of an internal investigation of a complaint against one of the named police officers by the other named police officer. The city has not explained how this information was used or developed in an investigation of child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find no portion of the information at issue is confidential under

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

³Some of the information you seek to withhold under section 552.1175 of the Government Code is held by the city in an employment capacity. We note section 552.117 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise for such information.

section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). Section 772.318 is not applicable, however, to information furnished by the 9-1-1 caller. *Id.* at 2; *see id.* at 3 (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). You state the city is part of an emergency communication district established under chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code. You contend some of the submitted information consists of the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished to the city by a 9-1-1 service supplier. However, upon review, we find the information at issue was provided directly by the 9-1-1 caller at issue. Thus, we find this information does not consist of the originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller that was furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier so as to be subject to chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

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

- (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 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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 at 3-4 (1988), 370 at 2 (1983), 343 at 1 (1982). Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue is confidential under the MPA. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code, which governs the public availability of information submitted to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (“TCOLE”) under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.454 provides as follows:

- (a) All information submitted to the [TCOLE] under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.
- (b) Except as provided by this subchapter, a [TCOLE] member or other person may not release information submitted under this subchapter.

Occ. Code § 1701.454. The submitted information includes information that was submitted to TCOLE pursuant to subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Furthermore, the information at issue does not indicate the officers at issue resigned or were terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides,

- (a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:
 - (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
 - (2) the person that requested the examination;

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

(3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;

(4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or

(5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

Id. § 1703.306(a), (b). The submitted information contains information acquired from a polygraph examination. The requestor does not fall within any of the categories of individuals who have a right of access to the submitted polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the polygraph information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining information at issue consists of information acquired from a polygraph examination for purposes of section 1703.306. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information 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 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). However, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *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 government 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).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in

conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion 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 and the attorney for the named officer 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, which is 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 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 the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) 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 also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having reviewed the information at issue, we have marked information that the city must withhold under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b) 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 (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section 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, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department’s use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with

law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984). Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate release of any of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, we find the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, 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 sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See 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 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). We also note section 552.117 is not applicable to a former spouse and does not protect the fact that a governmental employee has been divorced. We have marked information under section 552.117 that consists of the personal information of peace officers who were employed by the city and the information is held in the employment context. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(2). Additionally, we find no portion of the remaining information consists of the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, or family member information of a peace officer currently or formerly employed by the city, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the information we marked under section 552.117 pertains to individuals who are no longer licensed peace officers, then the marked information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of 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 be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only 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. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals at issue are no longer peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and to the extent these individuals timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue are no longer peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1). However, we find no portion of the remaining information consists of the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, or family member information of a current or former employee of the city, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(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. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of the personal information of a peace officer employed by another law enforcement agency. Thus, if the information we marked under section 552.1175 relates to an individual who 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. However, we find no portion of the remaining information consists of the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, or family member information of an individual subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

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 id.* § 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 information the city must withhold under sections 552.117 and 552.130 of the Government Code is contained within audio recordings. The city states it lacks the technical capability to redact this information from the recordings. Nevertheless, because the city had the ability to copy the submitted audio recordings in order to submit the requested information for our review, we believe the city has the capacity to produce a copy of only the non-confidential portions of the recordings. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted audio recordings in their entirety under either section 552.117 or section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code provides “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). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information consists of a copy of an identification badge issued to an official or employee of a governmental body. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code, section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, and common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue 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. To the extent the individuals at issue are no longer peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and to the extent these individuals timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code to the extent the individual to whom the information pertains elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 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,



Kristi L. Godden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLG/cz

Ref: ID# 551648

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melissa A. Mihalick
Counsel for Lieutenant. Jill Hamm
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002-2770
(w/o enclosures)