KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 25, 2015

Mr. Vance Hinds
Assistant County & District Attorney
Ellis County and District Attorney
109 South Jackson
Waxahachie, Texas 75165

OR2015-12687

Dear Mr. Hinds:

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# 568895.

The Ellis County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for (1) a copy of the contract between the sheriff's office and a specified company; (2) an accounting of the number of beds in Ellis County detention facilities; (3) the total number of non-attorney visitors at each detention facility; (4) the total number of "video-visitations" at each detention facility since the prohibition of face-to-face visitations; and (5) the total number of "video-visitations" occurring offsite each day since the prohibition. You state you do not have information responsive to categories two and five of the request.[1] Although you take no position as to whether certain portions of the submitted information are excepted under the Act, you state release of some of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of T-NETIX, Inc. and Securus Technologies, Inc. (collectively, the "third parties"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why

[1]The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). You claim the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you claim categories three and four of the request seeking the total number of non-attorney visitors and on-site video visitations requires the sheriff's office to answer questions and conduct legal research. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or create new information in responding to a request. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2. However, a governmental body must make a good faith effort to relate a request to information held by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990). We assume the sheriff's office has made a good faith effort to do so.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the third parties have protected proprietary interests in the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold the submitted information responsive to category one of the request on the basis of any proprietary interests the third parties may have in the 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. This section encompasses constitutional privacy, which protects two kinds of interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977). 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 Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. 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 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 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." *Id.* Implicit in this holding is an individual's association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined 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 and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See* 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). Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the inmate visitor logs you have submitted as responsive to categories three and four of the request under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional 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, the sheriff's office must withhold the submitted inmate visitor logs under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The sheriff's office must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to 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,

Mili Gosar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MG/akg

Ref: ID# 568895

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Peter F. Meitzner
T-NETIX, Inc.
14561 Dallas Parkway, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75254
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Pickins
Securus Technologies
14561 Dallas Parkway, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75254
(w/o enclosures)