May 17, 2018

Ms. Julie Pandya Dosher  
Counsel for City of Allen  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
1800 Ross Tower  
550 North Akard Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201  

Dear Ms. Dosher:

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# 709452 (Reference #97024).

The City of Allen (the “city”), which you represent, received a request for two specified city police department (the “department”) internal affairs investigations and all performance evaluations and commendations for a specified department officer. You state the city will withhold information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision Nos. 670 (2001) and 684 (2009). You also state the city

---

1 We note 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) (if 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).

2 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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number 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 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. See ORD 684. 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.
released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a police officer’s body worn camera recording. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

(1) the date and approximate time of the recording;

(2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not provide the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the body worn camera recording at issue was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by [s]ubsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” Id. § 1701.661(b).

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with confidentiality provisions found in chapter 55 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for some information. Articles 55.01 through 55.05 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provide for the expunction of criminal records in certain limited circumstances. Article 55.03 prescribes the effect of an expunction order and provides:

When the order of expunction is final:

³We assume that 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.
(1) the release, maintenance, dissemination, or use of the expunged records and files for any purpose is prohibited;

(2) except as provided in Subdivision (3) of this article, the person arrested may deny the occurrence of the arrest and the existence of the expunction order; and

(3) the person arrested or any other person, when questioned under oath in a criminal proceeding about an arrest for which the records have been expunged, may state only that the matter in question has been expunged.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 55.03. Article 55.04 imposes sanctions for violations of an expunction order and provides in part:

Sec. 1. A person who acquires knowledge of an arrest while an officer or employee of the state or of any agency or other entity of the state or any political subdivision of the state and who knows of an order expunging the records and files relating to that arrest commits an offense if he knowingly releases, disseminates, or otherwise uses the records or files.

Id. art. 55.04, § 1. This office has determined records subject to an expunction order are not subject to public disclosure under the Act. See Open Records Decision No. 457 at 2 (1987) (governmental body prohibited from releasing or disseminating arrest records subject to expunction order, as “those records are not subject to public disclosure under the [Act]”). You state, and submit documentation demonstrating, a portion of the requested information is the subject of an expunction order. The city must withhold the requested information subject to the submitted expunction order under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 55.03 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. See 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 has 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). You state the information you marked pertains to a closed 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 at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

4As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.
Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides “an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record.” Transp. Code § 730.004. “Personal information” means “information that identifies a person,” and includes a person’s photograph, social security number, driver identification number, name, and address, but does not include a zip code, telephone number, or medical and disability information. Id. § 730.003(6). The Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) is an “agency” for purposes of chapter 730. See id. § 730.003(1) (“agency” is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records). You state the information you marked consists of personal information the city obtained from DPS. See id. § 730.007(a)(2)(A)(i) (personal information may be disclosed to government agency in carrying out its functions). An authorized recipient of personal information may not re-disclose the personal information and to do so is a misdemeanor offense. Id. § 730.013(a), (d). Accordingly, the city must withhold the personal information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The 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, this office has also found the public has a legitimate public interest in the details of a crime. See Open Records Decision No. 400 at 4 (1983). See generally Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity” (citing Cinen v. Connick, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994)). We agree the city must withhold the dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in Industrial Foundation. Accordingly, 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 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process.
and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See Austin v. City of San Antonio, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. Id.; see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen., 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. See id. at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. See id. at 2.

You state the information you marked consists of a draft document that contains advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding policymaking matters of the city. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue pertains to a routine personnel matter. Thus, the information at issue does not pertain to policymaking matters of the city. Thus, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the body worn camera recording at issue was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it
need not be released. The city must withhold the requested information subject to the submitted expunction order under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 55.03 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city must withhold the personal information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. See Gov’t Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). After due consideration, we have decided to grant the request on this matter. Therefore, this letter ruling authorizes the city to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is a personal right that lapses at an individual’s death. See 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 Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 272 (1981), 192 (1978). Thus, this previous determination authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of living individuals. This previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth belonging to deceased individuals. We also note a person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to information that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the person’s privacy interests. See Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Consequently, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth requested by a person or the authorized representative of a person whose date of birth is at issue. Furthermore, information filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. See Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17); Star-Telegram v. Walker, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Accordingly, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth contained in court-filed documents. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the city need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information. See ORD 673 at 7-8 (listing elements of second type of previous determination under Gov’t Code § 552.301(a)).

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,

Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/gw
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