



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2015

Mr. Donald R. Stout
Counsel for the City of Midlothian
Colvin & Stout
P.O. Box 597
Ennis, Texas 75120

OR2015-21028

Dear Mr. Stout:

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# 582257.

The Midlothian Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for (1) video recordings from the patrol unit used by a named individual over a specified time period; (2) any contract or agreement between the City of Midlothian and the United States Internal Revenue Service (the "IRS") or any other federal agency in effect on a specified date concerning the Domestic Interdiction Highway Program; and (3) any records of communications between the department and the IRS or the United State Drug Enforcement Administration over a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 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:

(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 a contract and related reimbursement documents, which must be released unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception 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), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the department 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 department's arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.102 for the information at issue, as those sections can make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022. Further, we will address the department's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to pending criminal investigations with the department. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3). Accordingly, except for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this 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 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is 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 elements of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or 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 information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 you 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 has 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 none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the department may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

In summary, the department must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Abigail T. Adams". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 582257

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)