



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 20, 2018

Mr. Jeremy F. SoRelle  
Attorney for City of Granbury  
Hyde Law Firm, P.L.L.C.  
827 West Pearl Street  
Granbury, Texas 76048

OR2018-04012

Dear Mr. SoRelle:

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# 696268.

The City of Granbury (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for forty-eight categories of information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor, the police department officers involved, and the officers' training. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, 552.119 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted an officer report for the incident at issue. To the extent any information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See* 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), 470 (1987) (public employee’s job performance does not generally constitute employee’s private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We also note the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the general details of a crime. *See generally* *Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity” (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (5th Cir. 1994)); *Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d at 186-187 (public has

legitimate interest in details of crime and police efforts to combat crime in community). Furthermore, the requestor has a right of access to his own private information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold that information from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ( "person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the submitted information to which the requestor does not have a right of access is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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:

- (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime; [or]
- (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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1)-(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). Upon review of your arguments, we find you have neither demonstrated the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement nor demonstrated the information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of

a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). 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). Upon review, we find none of the submitted information is subject to section 552.117 and it may not be withheld on that basis.

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.

Gov't Code § 552.119(a). Upon review, we find the submitted information does not include any photographs. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.119. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

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/>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released. Gov't Code § 552.023. Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

[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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/gw

Ref: ID# 696268

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)