



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 18, 2016

Ms. Pat McGowan  
Counsel for the City of Fredericksburg  
P.O. Box 836  
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

OR2016-16140

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 618758.

The City of Fredericksburg (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel files of a named police officer. You state you have released some information to the requestor with redactions under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of 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 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you state you have released information with redactions under section 552.1175 of the Government Code, we note the proper exception in this instance is section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code because the city holds the information at issue in an employment context. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies to withhold the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. ORD 670 at 6.

an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> 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(a)(2) protects a peace officer's personal cellular telephone number only if the officer pays for the cellular telephone service with his or her personal funds. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 670 at 6 (2001) (Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure peace officer's cellular telephone number if officer pays for service), 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.<sup>3</sup>

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 information made confidential by other statutes, such as chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 611.002 pertains to mental health records and provides, in pertinent part,

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining "patient" and "professional"). Section 611.001 defines a "professional" as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only by certain individuals. *See id.* §§ 611.004, .0045; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the submitted information consists of a mental health record for purposes of chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, we note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions 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), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984). Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or 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. Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. 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](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# 618758

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)