



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 19, 2019

Mr. Stephen D. Gates
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79702

OR2019-04541

Dear Mr. Gates:

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# 750892 (ORR# M025166-112118).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

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

...

(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 the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information if its release would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Section 552.108(b)(1) protects internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that if released would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). A governmental body claiming subsections 552.108(a)(1) and (b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). 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 Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (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).

You state the submitted information, if released, would reveal law enforcement techniques and procedures and interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Based upon your representations and our review, we agree the release of some of the information at issue, which we marked, would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.¹ However, we find you have not demonstrated release of any of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. Further, you do not inform us release of the information at issue would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Therefore, the city

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by federal law. The remaining information contains information that was reported to the National Trace Center of the Department of Justice Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (the “ATF”). Public Law number 112-55 states, in pertinent part,

[D]uring the current fiscal year and in each fiscal year thereafter, no funds appropriated under [the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012] or any other [a]ct may be used to disclose part or all of the contents of the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center of the [ATF] or any information required to be kept by licensees pursuant to section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, or required to be reported pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (7) of such section, except to: (1) a Federal, State, local, or tribal law enforcement agency, or a Federal, State, or local prosecutor . . . unless such disclosure of such data to an[] . . . entit[y] described in (1) . . . of this proviso would compromise the identity of any undercover law enforcement officer or confidential informant, or interfere with any case under investigation; and no person or entity described in (1) . . . shall knowingly and publicly disclose such data; and all such data shall be immune from legal process, shall not be subject to subpoena or other discovery, shall be inadmissible in evidence, and shall not be used, relied on, or disclosed in any manner, nor shall testimony or other evidence be permitted based on the data, in a civil action in any State[.]

Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-55, 125 Stat. 552, 609-10 (2011). The remaining information contains Firearms Trace Summaries, which consist of content from the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center. Upon review, we agree the submitted Firearms Trace Summaries are confidential under Public Law number 112-55. *See Miller v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 562 F. Supp. 2d 82, 111 (D.D.C. 2008) (holding Firearms Trace Report properly withheld under Freedom of Information Act exemption 3, which covers records that are exempt from disclosure by statute). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Public Law number 112-55.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information (“CHRI”). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center 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.” Gov’t Code § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the federal government or other states. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to CHRI it generates. *See id.* 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(a). 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). 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. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F, of the Government Code. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Accordingly, the city must withhold the CHRI we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information is confidential CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 of the Government Code. *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.). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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 § 652I (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”). Thus, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and all living public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege for some of the remaining information. However, upon review, we find you failed to demonstrate the remaining information identifies informers for purposes of the common-law informer’s privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.² See Gov’t Code § 552.130. As noted above, the right of privacy lapses at death. Thus, motor vehicle record information that pertains solely to deceased individuals may not be withheld under section 552.130. See *Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; see also Attorney General Opinions JM-229; H-917; ORD 272. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

²The 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).

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Public Law number 112-55. The city must withhold the CHRI we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. The city must withhold the information we marked and all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.³

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,



James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/som

Ref: ID# 750892

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note the information being released contains social security numbers. 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 Gov't Code § 552.147(b).