



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 10, 2017

Ms. Leticia Brysch
City Clerk/PIO
City of Baytown
P.O. Box 424
Baytown, Texas 77522-0424

OR2016-25719A

Dear Ms. Brysch:

Our office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-25719 (2016) on November 18, 2016. Since that date, we have received new information that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on November 18, 2016. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act")). Your request was assigned ID# 652959.

The City of Baytown (the "city") received a request for twenty-three categories of information pertaining to a named individual. You state the city has no information responsive to portions of the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code.² You state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Taser International ("Taser"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Taser of the request for information and of its right to submit

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2(1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in providing some of the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we understand the city will redact personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).⁴ However, we note the city has also redacted the name, address, and date of birth of an inmate from the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

We note some of the submitted information falls within the scope of section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains completed reports that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the completed reports pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under

³We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.— Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), which we marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code protect information made confidential under law, we will consider the applicability of these sections for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). We will also consider your arguments against disclosure for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Taser explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude this party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to Taser on the basis of any proprietary interest it may have in the information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or

reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.⁵ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You contend the city reasonably anticipates litigation because the requestor seeks the requested information “on behalf of a litigation and injury attorney.” You state the submitted information pertains to an incident involving an inmate in the city jail. However, you do not inform our office that, at the time the city received the present request, anyone had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation regarding this matter. Further, you have not demonstrated anyone has made any claim for damages or any specific threat to sue the city. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. As such, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if

⁵In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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 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).

The information you marked consists of the city police department’s general orders, policies, and procedures regarding use of force, arrest, and prisoner transport. You contend disclosure of the information at issue would “hinder . . . police officers’ ability to . . . identify criminal activity and maintain control of their prisoners, in order to maintain a safe environment for all inmates and staff[.]” You further explain release of this information would allow the public to know how to “elude detection, submission and control, and thus allow them to overpower and harm themselves and others.” Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we agree that release of the information we marked would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1). However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information you seek to withhold on this basis would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Consequently, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability

of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *Id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with HIPAA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, or working papers used or developed by the city police department in an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code or in providing services as a result of an investigation. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. We

have no indication the city's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such rule exists. Given that assumption, the information at issue is confidential pursuant to section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.⁶

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides in pertinent part:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

...

(e) Law enforcement records and files concerning a child may be inspected or copied by a juvenile justice agency as that term is defined by section 58.101, a criminal justice agency as that term is defined by section 411.082, Government Code, the child, and the child's parent or guardian.

...

(j) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (e), the custodian of the record or file shall redact:

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(1) any personally identifiable information about a juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness who is not the child[.]

Fam. Code § 58.007(c), (e), (j)(1). Section 58.007(c) is applicable to law enforcement records of juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of section 58.007). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Section 58.007(e) allows for access to juvenile law enforcement records subject to section 58.007(c) by a child’s parent or guardian. *Id.* § 58.007(e). However, any personally identifiable information concerning another juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness must be redacted from documents subject to release under section 58.007(e). *Id.* § 58.007(j)(1). We note section 58.007(c) does not apply to law enforcement records that relate to a juvenile only as a complainant, victim, witness, or other involved party; rather the juvenile must be involved as a suspect, offender, or defendant for purposes of section 58.007. *See id.* § 58.007(c). Upon review, we find the remaining information does not depict a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 58.007(c) to the information you have marked. Because section 58.007(c) is not applicable to the information, you may not withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(j)(1) of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091 (b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), emergency medical services (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091. Upon review, we find the information we marked constitutes records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by EMS personnel. Thus, except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we marked

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.⁷

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

(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 medical 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 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).* Upon review, we find the prisoner reports we marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we are unable to determine whether the remaining prisoner reports were also created under the supervision of a physician. Thus, we must rule conditionally. If the remaining prisoner reports were created under the supervision of a physician, then they are subject to the MPA and the city must withhold them under section 552.101 on that basis. If the remaining prisoner records were not created under the supervision of a physician, then the city may not withhold them under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the biometric identifier under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual's biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the city must withhold the biometric identifier you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information ("CHRI"). 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." *Id.* § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 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); *see generally* Gov't Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, 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 not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411. We note, however, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b). We also note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). You assert section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code for the information you marked. Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of CHRI which the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of confidential CHRI. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer's civil service file and

another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), the officer's civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer's supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(3). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055; *see* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Gov't Code chapter 143). In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.).

All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or are in the possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer's misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer's civil service file if the police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

Id. § 143.089(g). In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental

personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g) to “information reasonably related to a police officer’s or fire fighter’s employment relationship”); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You state the information you marked is contained within the city police department’s internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on your representation and our review, we find the information at issue is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 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. Additionally, 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 the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). We also note 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). Moreover, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov’t Code § 411.082(2)(B)* (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual’s current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with

common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, 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 excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by this state or another state or country. *Id.* § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked, and the additional information we marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the social security number of a living person. *Id.* § 552.147. Upon review, we agree the city may withhold the social security numbers you marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to 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 may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. Except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. To the extent the information was created under the supervision of a physician, the city must withhold the remaining information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the biometric identifier you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the social security numbers you marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The city must release

the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

AC/bw

Ref: ID# 644975

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)