



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 12, 2017

Ms. Akilah Mance  
Counsel for the City of Katy  
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.  
Wortham Tower, Suite 600  
2727 Allen Parkway  
Houston, Texas 77019

OR2017-07826

Dear Ms. Mance:

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# 653032 (Ref # COK17-001).

The City of Katy (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all records relating to sustained disciplinary action and events pertaining to two named officers. You state the city has released some information. You state you will redact information pursuant to sections 552.136(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and information subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.119, and 552.122 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101.

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). 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). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

Section 552.101 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. Upon review, we find no portion of the submitted information constitutes CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in relevant part the following:

- (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 city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information consists of a physician-patient communication or a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

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, 348 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, the court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Although we have concluded a compilation of a private individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and is generally not of legitimate concern to the public, criminal history information compiled by a law enforcement agency in the process of hiring a peace officer is a matter of legitimate public interest. *Cf. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). 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), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). However, this office has found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to applicants and employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance, especially where the applicant was seeking a position in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 (1986), 423 at 2 (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, satisfies 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. However, we find the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

...

(b) An 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 is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). Sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) are applicable only if the information at issue relates to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments

explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the information at issue pertains to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or a deferred adjudication. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to purely administrative records that do not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. We note the information you seek to withhold consists of information from the personnel file of one of the officers at issue and is not information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Moreover, this personnel information is not an internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). Consequently, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. 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." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Record Decision Nos. 531 (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 city seeks to withhold the serial numbers of firearms and policies and guidelines regarding law enforcement firearms under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city states disclosure of the firearm serial numbers at issue would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution because the firearm serial numbers could be cloned onto illegal firearms used to commit crimes or be falsely included in a missing weapons report. Additionally, the city states the law enforcement policies and guidelines at issue "are not intended for public disclosure and [if released] would permit a private citizen to anticipate a weakness in the police department that would disarm current peace officers." After reviewing the information at issue and considering your arguments, we agree some of the submitted information would, if released, interfere with law enforcement. Therefore, the city may withhold the firearm serial numbers you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, you have failed

to demonstrate releasing the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1).

You state the city will redact information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).<sup>2</sup> Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a peace officer, as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with section 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to pager and personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the pager and cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). We also note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked pager and cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the pager and cellular telephone service. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.117(a)(2). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.119 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) A photograph that depicts a peace officer as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, the release of which would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer, is excepted from [required public disclosure] unless:

- (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information;
- (2) the officer is a party in a civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or
- (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding.

---

<sup>2</sup>Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies to withhold the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. ORD 670 at 6.

(b) A photograph excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) may be made public only if the peace officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

Gov't Code § 552.119. Under section 552.119, a governmental body must demonstrate, if the documents do not demonstrate on their face, that release of the photograph would endanger the life or physical safety of a peace officer. The city asserts "release of [the photographs] would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer given the amount of personnel and private information being released to the requestor." In this instance we determine you have not demonstrated, nor is it apparent from our review of the information at issue, that release of the photographs would endanger the life or physical safety of the peace officer depicted. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted photographs under section 552.119 of the Government Code.

Section 552.122(b) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "[a] test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]" *Id.* § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes "any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated," but does not encompass evaluations of an employee's overall job performance or suitability. ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(b) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of "test items" might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976). Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when the answers might reveal the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987); ORD 626 at 8.

The city seeks to withhold the submitted writing exercise and answer under section 552.122 of the Government Code. You assert the information at issue consists of standard test items. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes test items under section 552.122(b). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.122 of the Government Code.

You state the city will redact the motor vehicle record information it marked pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a). Upon review, we note the submitted information contains additional information subject to section 552.130. Therefore, the city must also

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

withhold the additional information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the firearm serial numbers you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked pager and cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the pager and cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the additional information we have marked pursuant to 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,



Sidney M. Pounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SMP/sdk

Ref: ID# 653032

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)