



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 16, 2015

Ms. Shirley Spitzer  
City of Beaumont  
Beaumont Police Department  
P.O. Box 3827  
Beaumont, Texas 77704-3827

OR2015-14457

Dear Ms. Spitzer:

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# 571870.

The City of Beaumont (the "city") received a request for a specified city ordinance, a list of names on a "Do Not Respond" list maintained by the city's police department, and an accounting of the number of bills sent to residents and the amounts collected for alarm permits. You state some information has been made available to the requestor. You claim 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 information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city raises section 552.108 of the Government Code for this information, that exception is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, under section 552.108. However, we will consider the city's arguments under section 552.101 for the information at issue, as that section can make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022. Further, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the remaining 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 section 1702.284(a) of the Occupations Code, which provides:

Information contained in alarm systems records maintained by a governmental body that concerns the location of an alarm system, the name of the occupant of an alarm system location, or the type of alarm system used is confidential and may be disclosed only to the [Texas Private Security Board], to the alarm company to which the confidential records relate, or as otherwise required by state law or court order.

Occ. Code § 1702.284(a); *see also id.* § 1702.002(1)(A)(ii) (defining "alarm system" as electronic equipment and devices designed to detect or signal the occurrence of a robbery or other emergency). Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of the names of occupants of an alarm system location made confidential by section 1702.284. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1702.284 of the Occupations Code. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information consists of the location of an alarm system, the name of the occupant of an alarm system location, or the type of alarm system used. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1702.284 of the Occupations Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection).

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 you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information 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 552.108(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 not established the release of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of this information under section 552.108(b)(1).

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.”<sup>1</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 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 1702.284 of the Occupations Code and the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 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](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# 571870

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).