



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 6, 2016

Mr. John C. West
General Counsel
Office of Inspector General
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
4616 Howard Lane, Suite 250
Austin, Texas 78728

OR2016-20001

Dear Mr. West:

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# 625330.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for all records regarding a named individual. You state you will withhold certain information pursuant to sections 552.1175 and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, and 552.134 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes,

¹Section 552.1175(f) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information subject to section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act, if the individual properly elects to keep such information confidential. *See* Gov't Code § 552.1175(b), (f). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

such as chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center.² *See id.* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F 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 not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of the Government Code. We note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.³ However, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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

²Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.084 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. Ellefson*, 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. 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 inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders that could also be threatened if their names were released. ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public's interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the submitted visitor logs, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.⁴

Section 552.134 of the Government Code relates to inmates of the department and provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Subsection (b) or by Section 552.029 [of the Government Code], information obtained or maintained by the [department] is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to:

...

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(2) information about an inmate sentenced to death.

Gov't Code § 552.134(a), (b)(2). You contend the remaining information falls within the scope of section 552.134. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of information about a non-death row inmate confined in a facility operated by the department for purposes of section 552.134. We also find the exceptions in section 552.029 are not applicable to this information. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.134 of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find the remaining information pertains to a death row inmate. Section 552.134 is not applicable to an inmate who has been sentenced to death. *See id.* § 552.134(b)(2). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.134 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.⁶ *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. We note the requestor has a right of access to his client's private information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.023; *see* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the date of birth of the requestor's client under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁶Section 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).

notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) 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.). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded that section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You assert release of the remaining information would compromise the department’s investigative techniques. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate release of any portion of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. We therefore conclude the department may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1).

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁷ 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”). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the

⁷The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Government Code and constitutional privacy. The department must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.134 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.⁸

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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 625330

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁸We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a ruling from this office.