



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 19, 2015

Ms. Aimee Alcorn  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Corpus Christi  
P.O. Box 9277  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2015-21932

Dear Ms. Alcorn:

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# 583631 (City File Number: 812).

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for nineteen categories of information, to include information pertaining to specified employees, specified job applications, communications between named individuals, during a specified period of time, specified job descriptions and minimum education requirements, and information pertaining to specified allegations of corruption or criminal conduct.<sup>1</sup> The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for the request under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the city received on July 30, 2015. *See* Gov't Code § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

<sup>2</sup>We assume the "representative 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). 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 than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note the city has redacted some of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue or has statutory authorization to withhold the information without requesting a decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). The city does not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold this information without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000) (previous determinations). Therefore, this type of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure. However, because we can discern the nature of the redacted information, being deprived of the information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nonetheless, in the future, the city must not redact information from the information it submits to this office unless it is authorized to do so by statute or the information is the subject of a previous determination under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Failure to comply with section 552.301 may result in the information being presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Next, 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:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108; [and]

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

*Id.* § 552.022(a)(1), (17). The submitted information includes completed reports that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed reports pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information also contains a magistrate-signed document that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(17). Although the city raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, this exception is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive

section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.1175 make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information subject to section 552.022.<sup>3</sup> We will also consider your arguments under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

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 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 also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Further, under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>4</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens’ dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the information we have marked and all public

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>4</sup>Section 552.102(a) 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).

citizens' date of birth must be withheld from the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(1), (b). The information we have marked relates to a city peace officer and the information at issue is not held by the city in an employment context. Section 552.1175(b) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of an individual who falls within the scope of section 552.1175(a), provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, to the extent the individual at issue elected to restrict access to his marked information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. However, if the marked telephone number is a cellular telephone number, the city must withhold it under section 552.1175 only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, if the individual at issue does not elect to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175. Additionally, if the telephone number we have marked is a cellular telephone number and the telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the telephone number may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Next, we turn to the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the

state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

The city states, and provides documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the request for information, lawsuits were brought against the city by the requestor. Thus, we agree litigation was pending when the city received the request. Furthermore, we find the remaining information is related to those pending proceedings. Therefore, the city may withhold this information under section 552.103(a).

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information at issue pertains to an individual who elected to restrict access to his marked information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. If the marked telephone number is a cellular telephone number, the city must withhold it under section 552.1175 only if a

governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader".

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KB-R/akg

Ref: ID# 583631

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)