



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 10, 2015

Ms. Julie P. Doshier
Counsel for the City of Lancaster
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-25982

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 590510 (ORR# 73675).

The City of Lancaster (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents associated with a named individual being placed on leave. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You indicate the city has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108,

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

and 552.137 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains press releases. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides information that has been voluntarily released to a member of the public may not subsequently be withheld from another member of the public, unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988). Accordingly, the city may not withhold previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. Although the city seeks to withhold the previously released information under sections 552.103 and 552.107(1) of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do 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. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold the press releases, which we have marked, under section 552.103 or section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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:

(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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not

²We note the city marked portions of the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, you have not provided any arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d at 475-76; *see also* ORDs 665 at 2 n.5, 663 at 5. Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code applies to confidential information, we will consider your arguments under section 552.101 for the information we have marked. Further, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 for the information at issue. We will also consider your remaining arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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 encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer’s civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), the officer’s civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer’s supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. A letter of reprimand does not constitute discipline under chapter 143. *See* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257. In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer’s misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer’s civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113,122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.).

All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or are in the possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer’s civil service file if the police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of

misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g). In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex.App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See* 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g) to "information reasonably related to a police officer's or fire fighter's employment relationship"); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You state some of the remaining information is maintained by the city's police department (the "department") in its internal personnel file for a department officer under section 143.089(g). You state the information at issue, which you have marked, relates to an internal affairs investigation that did not result in disciplinary actions against the department officer. However, we note the information at issue includes an incident report and related information that is also maintained independently from the department officer's personnel file. The present request does not specifically seek information from the department officer's personnel file. Instead, the requestor seeks all documents related to a named individual being placed on leave. The incident report and related information are related to the named individual being placed on leave. Thus, both the information contained in the officer's personnel file and any copies of investigatory materials the department maintains for law enforcement purposes are responsive. The city may not engraft the confidentiality afforded to records under section 143.089(g) to records that exist independently of the internal file. Accordingly, we find the information that is maintained solely in the department's internal investigative file, which we have marked, is confidential under section 143.089(g) and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government

Code. However, the information that is also maintained independently of the department's internal investigative file is not confidential under section 143.089(g) and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. We will therefore consider your additional arguments against disclosure with respect to the information you marked that is maintained independent of the internal file.

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 question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However,

an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

For purposes of section 552.103, “litigation” includes contested cases conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. Open Records Decision Nos. 588 at 2 (1991), 301 at 1-2 (1982). Likewise, “contested cases” conducted under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act (the “APA”), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, constitute “litigation” for purposes of section 552.103. *See, e.g.*, ORD 588 at 7, 301 at 2. Factors this office considers in determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum include whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* ORD 588 at 3-4.

The city argues it anticipates litigation between the named individual and the city because prior to the city’s receipt of the instant request for information, the named individual retained an attorney regarding her being placed on administrative leave. We note prior to the city’s receipt of the request for information, the attorney at issue made no threat of litigation against the city, made no claim for damages, and did not make any demand for payment or any other remedy. The city also states it received correspondence from the attorney stating he will “issue a press release in the form of a lawsuit that will be completely privileged” and informing the city “unless we have a decision from the city manager by Friday, we will take whatever action we deem appropriate in an attempt to rectify this overreaction by the city manager.” We note the city received the correspondence at issue after the city received the instant request for information. Upon review we find the city has failed to demonstrate the named individual or her attorney had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the city when the city received the instant request for information. Thus, we find the city has not demonstrated it reasonably anticipated litigation between the named individual and the city on the date the request for information was received for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code.

The city also argues it anticipates litigation between the city and the individual who is the subject of the incident report at issue (the “arrestee”) because the arrestee filed a formal complaint against the department with the city. You do not inform this office the complaint at issue is pending in any formal hearings under the APA. You also do not explain any other stage of the city’s complaint procedure constitutes litigation of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature for purposes of section 552.103. *See* ORD 588; *see generally* Open Records Decision No. 301 (1982) (discussing meaning of “litigation” under predecessor to section 552.103). Thus, we find you failed to demonstrate the complaint against the department constitutes pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103. We further find you have not demonstrated any individual has taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the city with respect to the complaint at issue. Therefore, we find the city has not demonstrated it

reasonably anticipates litigation between the arrestee and the city for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Accordingly, we find you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103 to any portion of the remaining information, and the city may not withhold the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. ORD 676 at 6-7. First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state some of the remaining information, which you have marked, consists of communications between the city's outside counsel and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the remaining information, which

we have marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, you inform us some of the information you marked was forwarded to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (the “FBI”) and the Texas Rangers Division (the “Texas Rangers”) of the Texas Department of Public Safety (the “DPS”). You do not explain the FBI and the Texas Rangers are privileged parties with respect to the matters at issue. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to establish the remaining information you marked constitutes privileged communications between attorneys for the city and their clients for purposes of section 552.107(1). Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue on that basis.

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 . . . 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 this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where an agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of another law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the other law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982).

You inform us the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is “information being held by a law enforcement agency regarding an open, pending criminal investigation.” You state the information relates to an internal investigation by the department into the department officer’s use of force. However, you do not inform us the department is currently conducting a criminal investigation into the matters at issue. You also inform us the information at issue was forwarded to the Texas Rangers and the FBI to “investigate for criminal liability.” However, you do not state, and have not provided this office with any demonstration, either the Texas Rangers or the FBI wishes to have the information withheld to protect the law enforcement interest of either agency. Accordingly, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) of

the Government Code to the information you marked, and the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors if “the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.] *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a concluded criminal investigation did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). You state some of the remaining information, which you have marked, relates to closed criminal investigations by the department that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation and our review, we find the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See id.* § 411.083(a). 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 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that DPS maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). 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. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one’s current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *See id.* § 411.082(2)(B). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.³

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

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. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States 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 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. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information).

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.⁴ *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. Thus, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

⁴Section 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides “an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record.” Transp. Code § 730.004. “Personal information” includes a person’s name, address, and driver identification number, but not the zip code. *Id.* § 730.003(6). DPS is an “agency” for purposes of chapter 730. *See id.* § 730.003(1) (“agency” is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records). You state the information you have marked was obtained by the department from DPS. *See id.* § 730.007(a)(2)(A)(I) (personal information may be disclosed to government agency in carrying out its functions). An authorized recipient of personal information may not re-disclose the personal information and to do so is a misdemeanor offense. *Id.* § 730.013(a), (d). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold (1) the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code; (2) the public citizens’ dates of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code; and (4) the personal e-mail address you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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](#), 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 "Claire V. Morris Sloan". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 590510

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)