



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 24, 2015

Ms. T. Trisha Dang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Sugar Land
P.O. Box 110
Sugar Land, Texas 77487-0110

OR2015-24771

Dear Ms. Dang:

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# 588237.

The City of Sugar Land (the "city") received a request for four items of information pertaining to a named individual. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You state the city does not have information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

§ 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that other statutes make confidential, such as section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

(c) A polygraph examiner to whom information acquired from a polygraph examination is disclosed under Subsection (a)(4) may not disclose the information except as provided by this section.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. We have marked portions of the submitted information that were acquired from a polygraph examination and are, therefore, within the scope of section 1703.306. It does not appear the requestor falls into any of the categories of individuals who are authorized to receive the polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. However, we find the city has not established any of the remaining information was acquired from a polygraph examination. Thus, we conclude the city failed to establish the remaining information is confidential under section 1703.306, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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 a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See* generally Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy).

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.² The city has failed to demonstrate, however, the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public

²As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the submitted information includes information that may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.³ 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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336, 348 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, to the extent the named individual is a city employee, the city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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. To the extent the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 and employed by the city, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the individual at issue is not currently a licensed peace officer, section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code may apply to the information at issue. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. If the individual at issue is a city employee and he made a timely election under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). If the individual is

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions like section 552.102 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions.

not a city employee or did not make a timely election under section 552.024, this information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1).⁴

To the extent the named individual is not a licensed peace officer or an employee of the city, the dates of birth we have marked subject to common-law privacy. 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. *Indus. Found.* 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.⁵ *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. However, we note the information at issue includes the requestor's date of birth. The requestor has a right of access to this information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself).

Accordingly, to the extent the named individual is not a licensed peace officer or city employee, the city must withhold the named individual's date of birth and the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

⁴If the named individual is not a licensed police officer or city employee or did not make a timely confidentiality election under section 552.024, we note section 552.147(b) of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold a living person's social security number without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

⁵Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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; *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the account numbers you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 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 addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure.


In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 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. To the extent the named individual is a city employee, the city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 and an employee of the city, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the individual is not currently a licensed peace officer but is a city employee and made a timely election under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the named individual is not a city employee, the city must withhold the named individual’s date of birth and the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information you have marked under sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure. The remaining information must be released.⁶

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.

⁶If the named individual is not a city employee, we note the information being released includes information that is confidential with respect to the general public. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.023(a), ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 588237

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)