



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 13, 2016

Ms. Katie Leininger
Assistant City Attorney
City Attorney's Office
City of Pearland
3519 Liberty Drive
Pearland, Texas 77581

OR2016-13422

Dear Ms. Leininger:

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# 614084.

The City of Pearland (the "city") received a request for all information related to a crime committed by two named individuals. You state some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also 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 representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we address your argument that some information is not subject to the Act. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as information that

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.

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

(1) by a governmental body;

(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). This office has ruled, however, that tangible physical items are not "information" as that term is contemplated under the Act. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990). In this instance, the requestor seeks police records and photographs regarding the crime at issue. Accordingly, we find the requestor does not seek any tangible physical items. You state that some of the submitted information, which consists of text messages and online communications, constitutes physical evidence obtained during the course of a criminal investigation. The Act requires a governmental body to make a good faith effort to relate a request to information that the governmental body holds or to which it has access. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 534 at 2-3 (1989). Upon review of your comments, we conclude the text messages and online communications you reference do not constitute tangible physical items as contemplated under the Act. Accordingly, we find all of this documentation is subject to the Act. As you have submitted a representative sample of the information at issue, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

Next, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[,] unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Austin Chronicle Corp. v. City of Austin*, No. 03-08-00596-CV, 2009 WL 483232 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 24, 2009, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); *see also Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). However,

because section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will address its applicability to the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17).² Further, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

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 laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions." *Id.* § 411.082(2). Part 20 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the National Crime Information Center network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990)*. Section 411.083 of the Government Code makes CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains confidential, except 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. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI. However, a criminal justice agency may only release CHRI to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. We note Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes confidential CHRI. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.153 of the Government Code, which provides, as follows:

- (a) A DNA record stored in the DNA database is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

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)*.

(b) A person commits an offense if the person knowingly discloses to an unauthorized recipient information in a DNA record or information related to a DNA analysis of a sample collected under this subchapter.

(c) An offense under this section is a state jail felony.

(d) A violation under this section constitutes official misconduct.

Id. § 411.153. A “DNA record” means the results of a forensic DNA analysis performed by a DNA laboratory. *See id.* § 411.141(6)-(7). “Forensic analysis” is defined as “a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action.” *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 38.35(4); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.141(10) (providing that “forensic analysis” has meaning assigned by article 38.35). A “DNA database” means “one or more databases that contain forensic DNA records maintained by the director of [DPS].” Gov’t Code § 411.141(5); *see id.* § 411.001(3).

The director of DPS is required to establish certain procedures for DNA laboratories. *See id.* §§ 411.142(h) (requiring director establish standards for DNA analysis), .144(a). Section 411.144 of the Government Code provides that a DNA laboratory conducting a forensic DNA analysis under subchapter G of chapter 411 shall comply with subchapter G and the rules adopted under subchapter G. *See id.* § 411.144(d); 37 T.A.C. §§ 28.81, .82 (describing minimum standards by which forensic DNA laboratory must abide); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.147(b).

Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of records relating to DNA analyses of samples that appear to have been collected under subchapter G of chapter 411 of the Government Code. We note this information appears to be the result of forensic DNA analyses performed by a DNA laboratory in accordance with DPS regulations. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153 of the Government Code. *See City of Fort Worth v. Abbott*, 258 S.W.3d 320, 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2008, no pet.) (section 411.153 of the Government Code prohibits release of DNA records held by city forensic science laboratory regardless of whether that record has been forwarded to DPS state DNA database).

Section 552.101 also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in relevant part the following:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is

confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 at 3-4 (1988), 370 at 2 (1983), 343 at 1 (1982).* Section 159.001 of the MPA defines "patient" as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Under this definition, a deceased person cannot be a patient under section 159.002 of the MPA. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).* Thus, the MPA is applicable only to records related to a person who was alive at the time of diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment to which the records pertain. Upon review, we find the city has not established any of the submitted information consists of records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician. Therefore, the submitted information is not confidential under the MPA, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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. Additionally, 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) (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). We also find a

compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. This office has also concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Furthermore, 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.³ *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. Further, because "the right of privacy is purely personal[.]" that right "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]" *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979) ("action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded") (quoting Restatement of Torts 2d); *see* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) ("the right of privacy lapses upon death"), H-917 (1976) ("We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death."); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Additionally, the city must withhold the dates of birth of all living public citizens 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 at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the

³Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses constitutional privacy, which 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 relating to the “zones of privacy” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education the United States Supreme Court has recognized. *See Fadlo 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 5 (internal quotations omitted) (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

We note some of the submitted information depicts the unclothed or partially unclothed body of an individual. We conclude the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of the informer’s privilege. Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated the information you seek to withhold identifies an informer for purposes of the common-law informer’s privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of the common-law informer’s privilege.

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. We note the purpose of section 552.130 is to protect the privacy of individuals. Therefore, driver's license information that pertains solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and the driver's license information of living individuals in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding 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"). We note the purpose of section 552.136 is to protect the privacy interests of individuals. Therefore, account information that pertains solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.136. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229, H-917; ORD 272 at 1. We have marked information generally subject to section 552.136. However, we note the information we have marked consists of account numbers and a debit card number which belongs to a deceased individual. To the extent the information we have marked pertains to accounts or a debit card in which any living individual has an interest, the city must withhold such information 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not of a type 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.

We note some of the city's information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and the dates of birth of all living public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and driver's license information of living individuals in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. To the extent the information we have marked pertains to accounts or a debit card in which any living individual has an interest, the city must withhold such information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.⁴

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,



Kavid Singh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KVS/som

⁴We note the remaining information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact the social security number of a living person without requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Ref: ID# 614084

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)