



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 14, 2017

Ms. Stacie S. White
Counsel for the City of Euless
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2017-18432

Dear Ms. White:

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# 670560.

The City of Euless (the "city"), which you represent, received seven requests from the same requestor for all information pertaining to the death of named individuals. You state the city will release some information. You also state the city will redact certain information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the

¹Section 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. 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). 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 under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains peace officers' Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification numbers.³ Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand an officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Accordingly, we find the officers' TCOLE identification numbers in the submitted information do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the TCOLE identification numbers are not subject to the Act and the city need not release them to the requestor.

²Although you also raise sections 552.108(b), 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code in your 10-day brief, you did not assert these sections in your fifteen-day brief. Thus, we assume you no longer assert these sections.

³The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education was renamed the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement by the 83rd Legislature. See Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., ch. 93, § 1.01, 2013 Tex. Gen. Laws 174, 174.

Next, we note some of the remaining 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[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibit D consists of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception 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 section 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 city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103. However, you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, which protects information made confidential under law, for some of the information at issue. Further, we note portions of the information at issue may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act.⁴ Accordingly, we will address the applicability of sections 552.101 and 552.1175 to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Additionally, we will address your arguments against disclosure for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . 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[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). In this instance, some of Exhibit C consists of records from an internal affairs investigation. Section 552.108 is generally not

⁴The 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).

applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and that does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982).

You state Exhibit C pertains to a closed criminal case that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information we have marked. However, the remaining information in Exhibit C consists of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature. Consequently, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to this information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2).

Section 552.108(a)(2) does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559, 560-61 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the information we have marked within Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (“HSA”). Section 418.182(a) of the Government Code provides in relevant part, “information . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.” *Id.* § 418.182(a). The fact that information may be related to a governmental body's security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

The information at issue consists of surveillance camera video recordings and photographic images from the Euless City Jail (the “jail”). You state the surveillance cameras at issue are part of the jail’s security system, which is “designed to protect the inmates and jail staff from terrorist and other criminal activities.” We understand some of the photographs at issue are still images taken from a surveillance camera video recording. You assert release of the information at issue “would reveal the specifications, layout, design, and capabilities of the jail’s security system.” Upon review, we find the video recordings and photographs we have marked and indicated relate to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See Tex. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (finding confidential under section 418.182 of the HSA video recording containing images recorded by security cameras in Texas Capitol hallway because specifications of security system included cameras’ capabilities and video recording demonstrated those capabilities through characteristics, quality, and clarity of images recorded). Accordingly, the city must withhold the video recordings and photographs we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is confidential under section 418.182. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue on that basis.

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

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] 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). We note some of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation by the city’s police department of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201). Thus, this information is within the scope of section 261.201(a). You have not indicated that the city’s police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists.

Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.⁵

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential 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). We have also found that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. *See* Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Under this definition, a deceased person cannot be a patient under section 159.002 of the MPA. *See* ORDs 487, 370, 343. Thus, the MPA is applicable only to records related to a person who was alive at the time of diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment to which the records pertain. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by someone under the supervision of a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under

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

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.⁶ However, we find none of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to section 159.002. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part as follows:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information consists of mental health records that are subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.⁷

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses laws that make criminal history record information (“CHRI”) confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center (“TCIC”) is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* at 10-12. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the 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) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for criminal justice purposes. *See id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. We note section 411.083

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

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

does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *Id.* § 411.082(2)(B). We note, because the laws governing the dissemination of information obtained from the NCIC or TCIC are based on both law enforcement and privacy interests, the CHRI of a deceased individual that is obtained from the DPS or another criminal justice agency may be disseminated only as permitted by subchapters E-1 and F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 565 at 10-12. We further note Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of confidential CHRI. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.⁸

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007. Fam. Code § 58.007(c). The relevant language of section 58.007 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:

- (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.

Id. § 58.007(c); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining "delinquent conduct" and "conduct indicating a need for supervision"). 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). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information identifies a juvenile suspect or offender for purposes of section 58.007.

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

Accordingly, we find you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 58.007(c) to the remaining information. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.007(c).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code is applicable to records of the provision of emergency medical services and provides, in 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.

(c) Any person who receives information from confidential communications or records as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 773.092 who is acting on the survivor's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was obtained.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b)-(c). Upon review, we agree some of Exhibit B consists of records made and maintained by emergency medical services personnel. However, we note the information at issue reveals the individual concerned was deceased when emergency medical services personnel arrived. The term "patient" is not defined for the purposes of section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. When a word used in a statute is not defined and that word is "connected with and used with reference to a particular trade or subject matter or is used as a word of art, the word shall have the meaning given by experts in the particular trade, subject matter, or art." Gov't Code § 312.002; *see also Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Garrison Contractors, Inc.*, 966 S.W.2d 482, 485 (Tex. 1998). Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary defines "patient" as "one who is sick with, or being treated for, an illness or injury; [or] . . . an individual receiving medical care." Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary 1446 (17th ed. 1989). We also note other statutes dealing with medically-related professions generally define "patient" as an individual who consults a health care professional. *See* Health & Safety Code § 611.001 (mental health records); Occ. Code §§ 159.001 (physician records), 201.401 (chiropractic records), 202.401 (podiatric records), 258.101 (dental records). Thus, because the generally accepted medical definition of patient indicates the term refers to a living individual, we find the term does not encompass information that concerns a deceased individual. Accordingly, we conclude section 773.091 is not applicable to the information at issue and the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which 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 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. See Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976), this office held those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a "first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure" and this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found "the public's right to obtain an inmate's correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate's correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure." *Id.* Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual's association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined inmate visitor and mail logs that identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 428, 430. Further, we recognized inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders that could also be threatened if their names were released. See also ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public's interest in this information. *Id.*; see ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Nevertheless, because "the right of privacy is purely personal[.]" that right "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]" *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also *Justice v. Belo Broad. Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) ("action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded" (quoting Restatement (Second) of Torts § 6521 (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) ("the right of privacy lapses upon death"), H-917 (1976) ("We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death."); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) ("the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death"). We note some of the remaining information consists of an inmate visitation record of an inmate who is deceased.

Although the inmate at issue is deceased and her privacy rights lapsed at death, the separate privacy interests of her visitor in their association with her is generally confidential under constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.1175. Accordingly, to the extent the information we have marked relates to currently licensed peace officers who have elected to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983).

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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 9-10 (1992) (employee’s withholding allowance certificate, 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). Additionally, the Third 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.). However, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; ORD 272. Therefore, information relating to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. 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. 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee’s private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of

government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard established by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth, including the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if these dates of birth do not pertain to currently licensed peace officers who have elected to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the TCOLE identification numbers are not subject to the Act and the city need not release them to the requestor. With the exception of basic information, which the city must release, the city may withhold the information we have marked within Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold video recordings and photographs we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(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 (1) section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, (2) the MPA, (3) section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, (4) section 411.083 of the Government Code, and (5) constitutional privacy. To the extent the information we have marked relates to currently licensed peace officers who have elected to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth, including the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if these dates of birth do not pertain to currently licensed peace officers who have elected to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 that reads "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "C" at the beginning.

Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/sb

Ref: ID# 670560

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)