



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 21, 2019

Ms. Melissa McDonald  
McLennan County Sheriff's Office  
901 Washington Avenue  
Waco, Texas 76701

OR2019-07943

Dear Ms. McDonald:

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# 755868.

The McLennan County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for all records pertaining to a specified death investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the sheriff's office has redacted portions of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, this information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to

make a ruling. In the future, however, the sheriff's office should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Next, we note some of the submitted information consists of a grand jury subpoena and information obtained pursuant to the grand jury subpoena. The Act is applicable to information "written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by a governmental body." *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1). The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See id.* § 552.003(1)(B); *see also id.* § 552.0035 (access to judicial records is governed by rules adopted by Supreme Court of Texas or other applicable laws or rules). This office has determined a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and therefore is not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 398 (1983). *But see* ORD 513 at 4 (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. To the extent the sheriff's office holds Exhibit C solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act and the sheriff's office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the sheriff's office does not hold Exhibit C solely as an agent of the grand jury, the information is subject to the Act and we will address the submitted arguments against its disclosure.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by statutes, such as section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations,<sup>1</sup> which protects information regarding detainees held on behalf of the United States Department of Homeland Security ("DHS").<sup>2</sup> This section provides as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>A federal statute or an administrative regulation enacted pursuant to statutory authority can provide statutory confidentiality for purposes of section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 476 (1987) (addressing statutory predecessor).

<sup>2</sup>We note the functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS") were transferred to DHS on March 1, 2003. *See* Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002).

No person, including any state or local government entity or any privately operated detention facility, that houses, maintains, provides services to, or otherwise holds any detainee on behalf of the Service (whether by contract or otherwise), and no other person who by virtue of any official or contractual relationship with such person obtains information relating to any detainee, shall disclose or otherwise permit to be made public the name of, or other information relating to, such detainee. Such information shall be under the control of the Service and shall be subject to public disclosure only pursuant to the provisions of applicable federal laws, regulations and executive orders. Insofar as any documents or other records contain such information, such documents shall not be public records. This section applies to all persons and information identified or described in it, regardless of when such persons obtained such information, and applies to all requests for public disclosure of such information, including requests that are the subject of proceedings pending as of April 17, 2002.

8 C.F.R. § 236.6; *see also id.* § 1.2 (defining Service as “U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and/or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as appropriate in the context in which the term appears”). We note some of the submitted information pertains to a detainee for purposes of section 236.6. We understand the sheriff’s office is required to abide by rules promulgated by DHS with regard to detainees. *See id.* § 2.1 (Secretary of Homeland Security may issue regulations to administer and enforce laws relating to immigration and naturalization of aliens); *see also ACLU of N.J., Inc. v. County of Hudson*, 799 A.2d 629 (N.J. 2002) (while state possesses sovereign authority over operation of its jails, it may not operate them, in respect to INS detainees, in any way that derogates federal government’s exclusive and expressed interest in regulating aliens). You do not provide our office with any applicable law, regulation, or executive order that provides the requestor with a right of access to the information at issue. We therefore conclude the information at issue is made confidential by section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code (providing the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish regulations necessary to carry out laws relating to immigration and naturalization) and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations.<sup>3</sup> *See ACLU*, 799 A.2d at 655 (concluding because INS had authority to promulgate 8 C.F.R. § 236.6, provision preempts state law requiring disclosure of requested information); *see also English v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *La. Pub. Serv. Comm’n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation).

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as 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).* Section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. 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 some of the remaining information, which we marked, constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we find none of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to section 159.002. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office 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 information protected by section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information (“CHRI”). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) 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 NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). *See generally* Gov’t Code ch. 411 subch. F. 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. 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). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411. Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of CHRI the sheriff’s office must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of confidential CHRI. Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

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)). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *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.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). However, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat’l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004).

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) as authority, this office held that 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 that 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 that “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 that inmate visitor and mail logs which 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 and 430. 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). Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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, 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*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; see also *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting 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.”); ORD 272. Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold the date of birth of the deceased individual you redacted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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 . . . if . . . release of the internal record

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]”<sup>5</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) 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 video recordings in Exhibit B consist of recordings of the interior of a county jail facility. You state the information at issue shows the interior portions of the jail, safety mechanisms, and security-related capabilities of law enforcement officers. You argue release of the information at issue would “reveal weaknesses in the jail’s security system or structural system or could reveal potential entry points for contraband.” You further argue release of this information could “jeopardize officer safety and undermine their ability to do their job.” Based on your representations and our review, we agree the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office may withhold the submitted video recordings in Exhibit B under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the sheriff’s office holds Exhibit C solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act and the sheriff’s office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The

---

<sup>5</sup>Although you cite to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code based on the substance of your argument.

sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. The sheriff's office must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The sheriff's office may withhold the submitted video recordings in Exhibit B under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The sheriff's office 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](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,



Emily Kunst  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EK/gw

Ref: ID# 755868

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)