



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 15, 2015

Mr. Cody Beauchamp
Assistant District Attorney
Navarro County
800 North Main Street, Suite 203
Corsicana, Texas 75110

OR2015-11724

Dear Mr. Beauchamp:

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# 567639.

The Navarro County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information pertaining to a specified arrest. You state the sheriff's office released some information. We understand the sheriff's office redacted some information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is 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 representative sample of information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the requestor contends portions of the requested information were previously released to the public and are now in the public domain. The Act does not permit the selective disclosure of information. *See id.* §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsections 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).

No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). If information has been voluntarily released to any member of the public, then that same information may not subsequently be withheld from another member of the public, unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Section 552.007 does not prohibit an agency from withholding similar types of information that are not the exact information that has been previously released. We note the submitted information is not the exact information that may have been previously released; thus, we will consider the sheriff's office's arguments against the disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we address the requestor's assertion the information the sheriff's office submitted as a representative sample of information is not representative of the whole of the information requested. We note, in requesting a decision from this office, a governmental body may submit to this office a representative sample of information rather than submitting all the requested records. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D). In doing so, it is the governmental body's burden to assure that the sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). Whether the sheriff's office has additional information it seeks to withhold that it has not provided is a question of fact. This office is unable to resolve disputes of fact in the open records ruling process. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 2 (1991), 552 at 4 (1990), 435 at 4 (1986). Where fact issues are not resolvable as a matter of law, we must rely upon the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our opinion, or upon those facts that are discernable from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See* Open Records Decision No. 522 at 4 (1990). Accordingly, we must accept the sheriff's office's representation the information submitted to this office is truly representative of the information for which the sheriff's office seeks a ruling as a whole. *See* ORDs 499, 497. This open records letter does not reach, and, therefore, does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested records, to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information that submitted to our office. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; ORDs 499 at 6, 497 at 4.

Next, we note the sheriff's office has redacted dates of birth. A governmental body may not withhold information from the public without asking this office for a decision under section 552.301 of the Government Code unless a provision of the Act or a previous determination specifically authorizes the governmental body to do so. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (previous determinations). You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the sheriff's office has been authorized to withhold a date of birth without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); ORD 673. Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an

exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the sheriff's office should refrain from redacting any information it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information pertains to a pending criminal case. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes the identity and description of the complainant, but does not include the identity of the victim, unless the victim is the complainant. *See* ORD 127. Thus, with the exception of basic information, including the identity and description of the complainant, the sheriff's office may withhold Exhibits B, C, and D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987). The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765

F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a "first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure;" and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found "the public's right to obtain an inmate's correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate's correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure." ORD 185. Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual's association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs that identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 430, 428. Further, we recognized inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders that could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public's interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Therefore, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

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. Upon review, we find none of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We 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.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, including the identity and description of the complainant, the sheriff's office may withhold Exhibits B, C, and D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The remaining information must be released; however, 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,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 567639

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)