



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 4, 2017

Mr. Jerry E. Drake, Jr.
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2017-00260

Dear Mr. Drake:

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# 640205.

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for specified types of information pertaining to specified topics involving either of two named individuals.¹ You state some information is being made available to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has redacted a portion of 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

¹You state the city sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

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.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to 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; [and]

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (17). The submitted information includes completed investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. The submitted information also contains a court-filed document, which we have marked, that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17), and must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a) may be withheld under section 552.103. However, as sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 can make information confidential under the Act, we will consider their applicability to the information at issue.² Additionally, we will consider your argument under section 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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).

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

(1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;

(2) the person that requested the examination;

(3) a member, or the member’s agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner’s activities;

(4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or

(5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

Occ. Code § 1703.306(a), (b). The information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code contains information acquired from a polygraph examination. The requestor does not fall within any of the categories of individuals who have a right of access to the submitted polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

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 common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas 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 established. *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 a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally private. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 455 at 9 (employment applicant's salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, personal pager and cellular telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12. If the individuals at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then 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. Conversely, if the individuals at issue are not currently licensed police officers as defined by article 2.12, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the individuals at issue are not currently licensed peace officers, then their personal information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* ORD 506 at 5-6. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The city may only withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individuals at issue elected confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. If the individuals at issue made timely elections under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) 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. Conversely, if the individuals at issue did not make timely elections under section 552.024, their information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Next, we turn to the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(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).

The city states, and provides documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Wanda Esker v. City of Denton, Texas*, Case No. 14-00942-158, was pending against the city in the 158th Judicial District Court of Denton County, Texas, when it received the instant request for information. You state the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations and our review, we find litigation was pending when the city received this request for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103.

However, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. We note some of the information at issue has been seen by the opposing party to the litigation. Therefore, the city may not withhold this information, which we have marked for release, under section 552.103(a). However, the city may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individuals at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, then 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. If the individuals at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure but made timely elections under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) 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. Except for the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103(a) 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, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 640205

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)