



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2016

Mr. Alan T. Ozuna
Counsel for the City of San Juan
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C.
701 East Harrison, Suite 100
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9165

OR2016-09035

Dear Mr. Ozuna:

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# 606849.

The City of San Juan (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information disseminated by the Law Enforcement Emergency Regional Response Team ("LEERT") to participating agencies. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department's use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the

information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

The city states the submitted information consists of internal procedures used by its police officers participating in the LEERRT program; information providing details of activities, procedures, and tactics applied in actual law enforcement operations; and LEERRT training rosters. The city states revealing the submitted information would interfere with the law enforcement objectives of the program and allow “individuals engaged in criminal conduct to modify their behavior by anticipating measures to be taken by the police, and conceal their criminal conduct or avoid apprehension.” Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated release of the information we have marked would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, we conclude section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code is not applicable to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

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 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. 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. 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.¹ *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*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential.² Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to peace officer as defined by article 2.122(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and to criminal investigators of the United States as described by Article 2.122(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See id.* § 552.1175(a)(1), (7). Section 552.1175(b) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of an individual who falls within the scope of section 552.1175(a), 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). Some of the remaining information pertains to individuals who may be subject to section 552.1175. Thus, if the information we marked pertains to a currently licensed peace officer or a criminal investigator of the United States as described by article 2.122(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the individuals elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

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 a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must

¹Section 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).

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.


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

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the information we marked pertains to a currently licensed peace officer or a criminal investigator of the United States as described by article 2.122(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the individuals elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 606849

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)