



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 4, 2015

Ms. Veta J. Byrd-Perez  
Associate General Counsel  
Rice University  
P.O. Box 1892  
Houston, Texas 77251-1892

OR2015-25452

Dear Ms. Bryd-Perez:

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# 589141 (RUPD Records Request Number 2015-008).

The Rice University Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You state the department will release some of the requested information. You argue the submitted information is not subject to the Act. In the alternative, you claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state the department sought clarification of the request for information, and the department has not yet received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this instance, you have submitted information you believe is responsive to the request and have made arguments against disclosure of this information. Thus, we assume the department has made a good-faith effort to relate this request to information the department holds, and we will address the applicability of your arguments to the information.

---

<sup>1</sup>We understand you to raise section 552.147 of the Government Code based on your markings.

Next, we address your claim that the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The 84th Legislature added section 51.212(f) of the Education Code, which reads as follows:

(f) A campus police department of a private institution of higher education is a law enforcement agency and a governmental body for purposes of [the Act], only with respect to information relating solely to law enforcement activities.

Educ. Code § 51.212(f). We note the department is a campus police department of a private institution of higher education. *See id.* §§ 51.212(e), 61.003. Thus, the department is a governmental body for purposes of the Act, and information maintained by the department is subject to disclosure under the Act, to the extent such information relates solely to law enforcement activities. You contend the submitted information does not relate solely to law enforcement activities. Upon review, however, we find the submitted information relates to an investigation into a potential theft. We note theft is a crime as defined by the Penal Code. Penal Code § 31.03(a). We further note an offense under this section of the Penal Code is a misdemeanor or felony. *Id.* § 30.05(e). Therefore, we find the submitted information is related solely to law enforcement activities, and, thus, is subject to the Act. Accordingly, we will address your claimed exceptions to disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 laws that make criminal history record information (“CHRI”) confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapters E-1 and F of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 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. Similarly, 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. *See id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (term CHRI does not include driving record information). We note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Accordingly, the department must withhold the CHRI we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.

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 that 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) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. 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.<sup>2</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 the information we have marked and the submitted dates of birth satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked and the submitted dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department has failed to demonstrate, however, the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts 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 department must withhold the motor vehicle

---

<sup>2</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).

record information you have marked and the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.


Next, you seek to withhold portions of the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code. This section provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act.<sup>3</sup> *Id.* § 552.147(a). Accordingly, the department may withhold the social security numbers you have marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the CHRI we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. The department must withhold the information we have marked and the submitted dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information you have marked and the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department may withhold the social security numbers you have marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/akg

---

<sup>3</sup>We note section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

Ref: ID# 589141

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)