



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 15, 2015

Ms. Donna L. Johnson  
Counsel for City of Dickinson  
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.  
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2015-14422

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 571605 (City Ref. No. COD15-008).

The City of Dickinson (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for personnel documents pertaining to two named officers employed by the city. The city states it has released some information. The city claims portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The city also states release of the submitted information may implicate the privacy interests of third parties. Accordingly, the city states, and provide documentation showing, it notified the third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *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). We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") personal identification numbers.<sup>2</sup> In Open Records Decision

---

<sup>1</sup>As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the third parties.

<sup>2</sup>The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education was renamed the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement by the 83<sup>rd</sup> Legislature. *See* Act of May 6, 2013, 83<sup>rd</sup> Leg., R.S., ch. 93, § 1.01, 2013 Tex. Gen. Laws 174. 174.

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 officers' TCOLE identification numbers are unique computer-generated numbers assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database, and may be used as access device numbers on the TCOLE website. Accordingly, TCOLE personal identification numbers do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Thus, the submitted TCOLE personal identification numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, including chapter 552, Government Code, except as provided by Sections 730.005-730.007, an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record." Transp. Code § 730.004. Section 730.004 applies only to an "agency" that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records. *See id.* § 730.003(1). The city has not established it compiles or maintains motor vehicle records; therefore, section 730.004 does not apply to the city, and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part:

(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). For purposes of section 58.007(c), a "child" is a person who was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Thus, under section 58.007, law enforcement records relating to a juvenile

engaged in delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). Upon review, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information depicts an individual who is ten years of age or older and under the age of seventeen as a suspect or offender of delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision. *See id.* § 51.03(a)-(b). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(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.

Occ. Code § 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 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).* Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information consists of a physician-patient communication or a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information (“CHRI”) confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (the “NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means “information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their

dispositions.” *Id.* § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). *See generally* Gov’t Code §§ 411.081-.1409. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See id.* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411, subchapter F. We note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. We also note, however, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual’s current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b). We further note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the CHRI we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 and federal law. However, none of the remaining information consists of confidential CHRI under chapter 411 and, thus, the city may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.192 of the Government Code, which governs the release of information maintained by 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 [Act].

(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. Thus, 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 section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides that “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *See id.* § 560.003; *see also id.* §§ 560.001(1) (defining “biometric identifier” to include fingerprints), .002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless individual consents to disclosure). Upon review, we find the fingerprint we have marked constitutes a biometric identifier for purposes of section 560.003 of the Government Code. Thus, the city must withhold the marked fingerprint under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which pertains to L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms required by TCOLE. Section 1701.306 provides the following:

(a) [TCOLE] may not issue a license to a person unless the person is examined by:

- (1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and
- (2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a blood test or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCOLE]. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a)-(b). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the L-2 and L-3 forms we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.

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. 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. U.S. 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. However, we note criminal history information obtained by a law enforcement agency in the process of hiring a peace officer is a matter of legitimate public interest. We also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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, none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest and thus, none of it 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). We understand the city 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. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). The city states some of the remaining information, which we have marked pertains to investigations that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) 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. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. 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." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.).

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is 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.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 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). Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate how release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. 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 an individual's personal post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117, and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.117. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 6 (1994) (purpose of section 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. However, we find none of the remaining information is confidential under section 552.117(a)(2) and, thus, none of it may be withheld on that basis.

We note portions of the basic information are subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Section 552.1175 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(b). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Therefore, if the peace officer at issue elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175. If the peace officer at issue does not elect to restrict access to his information, the city may not withhold this information.

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.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Upon review, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

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 submitted TCOLE personal identification numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The city must withhold the CHRI we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 and federal law. 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. The city must withhold the marked fingerprint under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the L-2 and L-3 forms we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. 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 must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the peace officer at issue elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the

information we have marked under section 552.1175. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information; 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](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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 571605

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

3<sup>rd</sup> Parties  
(w/o enclosures)