



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 1, 2016

Ms. Ann-Marie Sheely
Assistant County Attorney
Travis County
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767-1748

OR2016-02321

Dear Ms. Sheely:

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# 596401.

The Travis County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for jail telephone records for a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under

section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting Ramie, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefsort*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185 at 2. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” *Id.* Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs that identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 430, 428. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The right of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. ORD 185; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). The submitted information consists of communications with an inmate. Accordingly, we find the submitted information is confidential under constitutional privacy.

You ask whether the sheriff’s office may transfer the requested information to the requestor as an intergovernmental or interagency transfer. This office has concluded that information subject to the Act may be transferred between governmental bodies without waiving exceptions to the public disclosure of that information or affecting its confidentiality. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-590 (1986); Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 567 (1990), 561 (1990), 516 (1989). These decisions are based on the well-settled policy of this state that governmental agencies should cooperate with each other in the interest of the efficient and economical administration of their statutory duties. *See* ORD 516. However, the transfer of confidential information from one governmental body to another is prohibited where a relevant confidentiality statute authorizes release of the confidential information only to specific entities, and the requesting governmental body is not among the statute’s enumerated entities. *See* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n.6 (1995) (intergovernmental transfer permitted under statutory confidentiality provision only where disclosure to another governmental agency is required or authorized by law), JM-590 at 4-5 (1986) (where governmental body is not included among expressly enumerated entities to which confidential information may be disclosed, information may not be transferred to that


governmental body). Further, this office has concluded, absent a federal law requiring disclosure, a governmental body may not disclose confidential information to a federal agency as an interagency transfer. *See* Open Records Decision No. 650 (1996); *see also* Attorney General Opinions MW-565 at 4 (1982), H-242 at 4 (1974); Open Records Decision No. 561 at 6 (1990).

You state the requestor, a representative of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement Homeland Security Department (“ICE”), is a “federal law enforcement agency.” However, neither the sheriff’s office or ICE has informed us of any provision of law, nor are we aware of any, that requires disclosure of the information at issue. Accordingly, we conclude the sheriff’s office must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/dls

Ref: ID# 596401

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)