



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 26, 2017

Ms. Cynthia Trevino
Counsel for the City of Rosenberg
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C.
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2017-08836

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 654941 (City ID No. R-2017-0003).

The City of Rosenberg (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to two named city police officers.¹ You state you will release some information upon payment of a cost estimate.² You state you will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.³ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101,

¹You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *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).

²You inform us the city sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615.

³Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 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).

552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by 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). You state Exhibit F was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the Grand Prairie Police Department. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.⁵ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

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

⁴Although you claim section 552.1175 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.117 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the city holds the submitted information in an employment capacity.

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

personal privacy.”⁶ 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). Accordingly, the city must withhold the employee’s date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁷

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the 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 further note section 552.117(a)(2) is not applicable to a former spouse and does not protect the fact that a governmental employee has been divorced. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.⁸ Upon review, however, we find the remaining information you marked does not consist of the home address, telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, or family member information of a peace officer. Thus, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2).

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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth

⁶The 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).

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

⁸As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information

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.). This office has also 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) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. ORD 545.

Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, 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 city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information at issue, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses you marked and we marked

under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the employee's date 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 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. 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 must withhold the personal e-mail addresses you marked and we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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,



Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/sb

Ref: ID# 654941

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)