



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2015

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

OR2015-07736

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# 560918 (Ref No. COM15-006).

The City of Manvel (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for five categories of information pertaining to a specified strip center, the feeding of stray cats and kittens, and training records of current city police department officers. You state the city released some of the requested information. You state the city will redact certain information pursuant to sections 552.130(c), 552.136(c), and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision Nos. 684 (2009) and 670 (2001).¹ You claim portions of the submitted information

¹Section 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). 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). 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). Open Records Decision No. 670 is a previous determination that 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. ORD 670 at 6. Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* ORD 684.

are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code, which provides:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). Section 58.007(c) is applicable to law enforcement records of juvenile delinquent conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of section 58.007). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). We note the information at issue consists of internal e-mail communications pertaining to officer training. This information does not constitute juvenile law enforcement records for the purposes of section 58.007(c). Accordingly, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Id. § 261.201(a). You assert the information at issue was used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse. *See id.* §§ 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). However, we note the information at issue consists of internal e-mail communications pertaining to officer training. Thus, we find this information does not consist of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. *See* Health & Safety Code ch. 772. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000.

You assert the submitted information contains the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers. Upon review, however, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information consists of an originating telephone number or address of a 9-1-1 caller furnished by a service supplier so as to be subject to chapter 772. Therefore, none of the submitted information is confidential under chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

You also claim section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of

statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must involve a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5. The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You seek to withhold the identifying information of individuals who reported possible violations of law. However, you do not inform us what criminal or civil statutes were reported to be violated, or whether the violations carry criminal or civil penalties. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the information at issue identifies a complainant for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of the common-law informer’s privilege.

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, this office has also found that common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. We note because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977)); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). 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 to be highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern.

Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

...

(b) An 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 is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). A governmental body claiming sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. You state "certain information requested" relates to concluded cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. However, you have not specified which portions of the information at issue pertain to concluded cases. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) to the information at issue, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on those bases. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why claimed exceptions to disclosure apply).

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[.]" *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1). 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 writ). 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 (1989) (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 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). 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).

You argue portions of the remaining information reveal officers’ schedules. You explain “release of a peace officer’s daily schedule could potentially compromise the safety of the officers and the operations in which the officers are currently working.” Based on your arguments and our review, we find you have demonstrated release of the information we have marked would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate that release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information 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.² Gov’t Code § 552.1175(b). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.1175(a)(1). We note the audio recording we have indicated contains the personal information of a peace officer. Although you claim the city does not have the technological capability to redact information from the submitted recording, because the city had the ability to copy the submitted audio recording in order to submit the requested information for our

²The 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).

review, we believe the city has the capability to produce a redacted copy of the submitted audio recording. Accordingly, if the officer whose information is at issue elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold this information under section 552.1175. If no election is made, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.1175 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 common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. If the officer whose information is at issue elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.1175 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,



Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/cbz

Ref: ID# 560918

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)