



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 17, 2016

Mr. Richard L. Bilbie
Assistant City Attorney
City of Harlingen
P.O. Box 2207
Harlingen, Texas 78551-2207

OR2016-13784

Dear Mr. Bilbie:

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# 614681.

The City of Harlingen (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's background investigation. 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.

We note you seek to withhold the submitted information based on a confidentiality agreement with the requestor. However, we note information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests it be kept confidential. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act by agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information did not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, the city must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Section 552.108(b)(1) 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 . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code

§ 552.108(b)(1); *see City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d at 327 (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See e.g.* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state release of the submitted information would allow an individual to alter or skew the application process by having knowledge of the process in advance. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the release of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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. We understand you to raise section 552.101 based on the theory that information is confidential when a federal agency shares confidential information with a state agency. This office has repeatedly held that the transfer of confidential information between governmental agencies does not destroy the confidentiality of that information. *See* Attorney General Opinions H-917 (1976), H-836 (1974); Open Records Decision Nos. 561, 414 (1984), 388 (1983), 272 (1981), 183 (1978). These opinions recognize the need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between state agencies. In Open Records Decision No. 561, we considered whether the same rule applied regarding information deemed confidential by a federal agency. In that decision, we noted the general rule that section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code, the federal Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), applies only to federal agencies and does not apply to records held by state agencies. ORD 561 at 6. Further, we stated information is not confidential when in the hands of a Texas agency simply because the same information is confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *Id.* However, in the interests of comity between state and federal authorities and to ensure the flow of information from federal agencies to Texas governmental bodies, we concluded, “when information in the possession of a federal agency is ‘deemed confidential’ by federal law, such confidentiality is not destroyed by the sharing of the information with a governmental body in Texas. In such an instance, [section 552.101] requires a local government to respect the confidentiality imposed on the information by federal law.” *Id.* at 7. However, beyond your general assertion that some of the records at issue were provided to the city by a federal agency, you have not directed our attention to any federal law, nor are we of any, that makes the information confidential. Therefore, the city may not withhold

any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 demonstrated. *See 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, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We also note this office has found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to applicants and employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance, especially where the applicant was seeking a position in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Criminal history information obtained by a law enforcement agency in the process of hiring a peace officer is also a matter of legitimate public interest. We note the requestor has a right of access to his own private information in the submitted information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at (4) (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Furthermore, we find you have failed to demonstrate any other portions of the submitted information are highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.


Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center ("NCIC") 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." Gov't Code § 411.082(2). Part 20 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC 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 subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of chapter 411 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 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information constitutes CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 or federal law. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the submitted information.¹

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

AKC/dls

Ref: ID# 614681

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹We note the requestor has a right of access beyond that of the general public to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.