



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2017

Mr. Terrance Garmon  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Tyler  
P.O. Box 2039  
Tyler, Texas 75710

OR2017-04481

Dear Mr. Garmon:

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# 647496 (LegalDesk# JLN-243039).

The City of Tyler (the "city") received six requests from the same requestor.<sup>1</sup> You inform us the city will provide the requestor some of the requested information upon payment of costs. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.119, 552.130, 552.136, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, you claim the requests for information are vague, unreasonably burdensome, and overbroad in scope. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to

---

<sup>1</sup>You state, and provide documentation showing, the city sought clarification of the request for information and received a response from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). It is nevertheless proper for a governmental body to require a requestor to identify the records sought. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 304 (1982), 23 (1974). For example, where governmental bodies have been presented with broad requests for information rather than specific records we have stated the governmental body may advise the requestor of the types of information available so the requestor may properly narrow the request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974). A request for records made pursuant to the Act may not be disregarded simply because a citizen does not specify the exact documents he desires. *See* Open Records Decision No. 87 (1975). We note if a request for information is unclear, a governmental body may ask the requestor to clarify the request. Gov't Code § 552.222(b); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8 (1990), 333 (1982). However, we note the administrative inconvenience in responding to a request for information is not grounds for refusing to comply with a request under the Act. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 687 (Tex. 1976); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 497 at 4 (1988) (fact that submitting copies for review may be burdensome does not relieve governmental body of its responsibility to do so). In this instance, you state the city has asked the requestor to clarify his requests. In his response to the city's requests for clarification, the requestor refused to clarify any of his requests. In this case, as you have submitted information responsive to the requests and have raised exceptions to disclosure for this information, we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to this information.

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. The city raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for some of 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, except 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. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), 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 id.* § 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 submitted information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the City of Tyler 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.* 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 city maintains the information at issue in the internal files of the city's police department (the "department") pursuant to section 143.089(g). You inform us the department determined there was insufficient evidence to sustain the charges of misconduct for the complaints at issue. We note two complaints resulted in disciplinary action other than that prescribed by chapter 143. See Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-.055 (removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty). The remaining complaints did not result in disciplinary action. We therefore conclude the information you have marked is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by 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. The relevant language of section 58.007(c) reads as follows:

(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:

---

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

- (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.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). 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). The information at issue pertains to juvenile suspects who were ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the incidents that are the subject of the reports at issue. Further, this information involves delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply; therefore, case numbers 16-006620 and 16-007046 are confidential pursuant to section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, and the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders federal tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]” *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Thus, the submitted W-4 form, which we have marked, constitutes tax return information that is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, and the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining 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[.]”<sup>5</sup> 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 information 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Whether the public’s interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Record Decision No. 373 (1983). Furthermore, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, 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).

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

---

<sup>5</sup>The 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).

substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>6</sup> *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. Upon review, we find the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>7</sup>

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code applies to records a governmental body holds in an employment capacity and excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). 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)*. Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. You have provided a copy of an election form completed by the named employee, in which he elected to keep the information at issue confidential. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>8</sup>

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. *See Gov't Code § 552.130*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>6</sup>As previously noted, section 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).

<sup>7</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

<sup>8</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.

In summary, the city must withhold (1) the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code; (2) case numbers 16-006620 and 16-007046 in their entireties under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code; (3) the submitted W-4 form, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code; (4) the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code; (5) all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (6) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; and (7) the motor vehicle record information we have marked and you 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,



Cole Hutchison  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CH/eb

Ref: ID# 647496

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)