



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 7, 2016

Mr. Shan Rutherford
Special Counsel for the City of Lampasas
Law Offices of JC Brown, P.C.
1411 West Avenue, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-00507

Dear Mr. Rutherford:

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# 593370.

The City of Lampasas (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified information pertaining to two named individuals during a specified time period and telephone records and e-mails sent to or from a third named individual during the same time period. A second request from a different requestor seeks all reports pertaining to the two named individuals. You claim some of the submitted information does not consist of public information subject to the Act. Further, you claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.¹

Initially, you argue some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to "public information," which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

¹We 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.

- (1) by a governmental body; or
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if it is "created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body." *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

You inform us the information submitted as Exhibit H consists of e-mails that do not pertain to official business. You indicate the information is purely personal in nature and does not concern the business of the city. Thus, you argue the information at issue does not constitute public information subject to the Act. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find some of this information, which we have marked, does not constitute "information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business" by or for the city. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002. Therefore, we conclude the information we marked does not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 7 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Accordingly, the city is not required to release the information we marked in response to the request for information. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is maintained by the city in connection with the transaction of its official business, and therefore is subject to the Act. The city must release the remaining information in Exhibit H unless the city demonstrates the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

Next, we note some of the responsive 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 responsive information includes investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are 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 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, 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. Further, 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. Moreover, because sections 552.1175 and 552.130 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information at issue.² We will also consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses 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. This office has found a compilation of an individual's criminal

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

history 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 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, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. 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).

The second request seeks all reports pertaining to the second requestor and another named individual. You argue this request requires the city to compile the other named individual's criminal history and implicates that named individual's right to privacy. Upon review of the request at issue and the information responsive to that request, we find the second requestor is, in part, seeking reports involving issues of domestic violence between herself and the named individual. Because the requestor is aware of each of these reports, we find this aspect of the request does not implicate the named individual's right to privacy. We further find several of the reports you seek to withhold on this basis relate to routine traffic violations. Finally, the remaining reports at issue do not list the other named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the submitted reports consist of a compilation of the named individual's criminal history, and the city may not withhold any part of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information, as well as to the remainder of the submitted information.

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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was 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. *See 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

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.

You argue the responsive information relates to litigation that is reasonably anticipated by the city. You explain in his request for information, the first requestor states he is an attorney

who represents one of the individuals named in his request. You also inform us on the same date the city received the first request for information, the first requestor submitted correspondence to the city stating he was retained “with regards to specific complaints that [his client] has with” the city’s police department. However, you do not represent to this office that the first requestor’s correspondence complies with the TTCA or any applicable ordinance. Further, we note this correspondence makes no threat of litigation against the city, no claim for damages, and no demand for payment or any other remedy. You also inform us after the city received the first request for information, the first requestor submitted additional correspondence to the city stating complaints had been filed with the Lampasas County Sheriff’s Department, the Texas Rangers, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as with the Office of Inspector General at the Texas Department of Public Safety. You do not inform this office any complaint was pending in any formal administrative proceeding under the APA and you do not explain any other stage of the city’s complaint procedure, or those of the agencies mentioned above, 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 have failed to demonstrate any individual had taken any objective, concrete steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the city received the request for information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e); Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You also inform us the first requestor’s client and the second requestor are “in the process of obtaining a divorce” and you argue the first requestor is “attempting to use the [Act] to gain access to information helpful to his client’s pending divorce proceeding.” However, we note neither the city, nor an officer or employee of the city, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment with the city, is a party to the divorce proceedings. Upon review, therefore, we find you have failed to establish that, on the date the city received the first request for information, the city reasonably anticipated litigation to which the city or an officer or employee of the city would be a party for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You next assert some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [or]

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1)-(2). Generally, section 552.108(a)(1) is mutually exclusive of section 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information that pertains to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. In contrast, section 552.108(a)(2) protects information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. 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). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication.

You state the city seeks to withhold the information you have highlighted in the submitted incident reports because the highlighted information pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the information you have highlighted 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 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information you highlighted. You also argue some of the remaining responsive information is protected by section 552.108 because “a large volume of the [e-mails] sought will involve law enforcement investigations that are either ongoing or have been resolved by other than a conviction[.]” However, you have submitted multiple incident reports and e-mails, and you have not identified which of the remaining reports and e-mails are related to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions and which reports are related to concluded cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the release of any of the remaining responsive information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108 to any portion of the remaining information at issue. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

We note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). The basic information includes, among other items, a detailed description of the offense. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. In this instance, you have highlighted the entire narrative portions of the incident reports at issue as information you seek to withhold under section 552.108. The remaining information does not contain information sufficient to satisfy the requirement that a “detailed description of the offense” be released as basic information. *See id.* Accordingly, we determine the city must release a sufficient portion of the narrative to encompass a detailed description of the offense. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the information you highlighted under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). 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 the information submitted as Exhibit F consists of communications involving attorneys for the city 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 intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

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

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Some of the remaining responsive information is part of an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police department (the "department"). *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. You do not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).*

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, which reads as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are

separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). We note section 58.007(c) applies only to law enforcement records that involve a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. You argue some of the remaining information is subject to section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information lists a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. Thus, you have not demonstrated the remaining information involves juvenile conduct for purposes of section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Some of the remaining information, including some of the basic information you highlighted, is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.*, 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.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. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must generally withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we note the first requestor has a right of access to his client’s private information, and the second requestor has a right of access to her own information, that would otherwise be withheld to

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).

protect their privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Accordingly, the city may not withhold from a requestor any private information to which that requestor has a right of access.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* 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. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, 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). We also note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

Some of the remaining responsive information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Section 552.1175 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). Some of the remaining information relates to individuals who are licensed as peace officers but the information is not held by the city in an employment context. Accordingly, to the extent the information at issue, which we have marked, relates to individuals who are currently licensed as peace officers and who elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed as peace officers or do not elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See id.* § 552.130. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining responsive information consist of motor vehicle record information. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, we note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Thus, the first requestor has a right of access to his client's motor vehicle record information and the second requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold under section 552.130 any motor vehicle record information from a requestor who has a right of access to that motor vehicle record information. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government 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 addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the information we marked in Exhibit H is not subject to the Act and the city is not required to release that information in response to the request for information. With the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the information you highlighted under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with

section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, the city may not withhold the marked information from a requestor who has a right of access to the information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. To the extent the information at issue relates to individuals who are currently licensed as peace officers and who elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked motor vehicle record information from a requestor who has a right of access to the information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code and must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining responsive information.⁵

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

⁵The information being released contains social security numbers. 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* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Ref: ID# 593370

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)