



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 12, 2019

Ms. Eileen M. Hayman
Assistant City Attorney for the City of Eastland
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, P.L.L.C.
500 Chestnut Street, Suite 1601
Abilene, Texas 79602

OR2019-09952

Dear Ms. Hayman:

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# 759084.

The City of Eastland (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to two specified criminal cases, an internal affairs investigation, and contact information of two named individuals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibits C, D, and E consist of completed investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature 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 Gov't Code § 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 information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions for the information at issue.

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. This section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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). You state Exhibits C and D relate to investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police department. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of

chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. You do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold Exhibits C and D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.¹ See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. See *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

The city states, and provides documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Jackson v. City of Eastland*, Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-12, was filed against the city in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Abilene Division on the same day it received the first request for information. You state the information at issue is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the submitted information, we find litigation was pending when the city received these requests

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.

for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.²

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. The doctrine of common-law privacy 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). 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 the city must withhold the dates of birth of city employees under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

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). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Criminal Procedure. We note some of the remaining information, which we marked and indicated, may be subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(2).

If the information at issue pertains to a current or former city employee who is not a licensed peace officer, then the information at issue is subject to section 552.117(a)(1) 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 id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, to the extent the current or former employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

As discussed above, 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.*, 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 found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992)* (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). We note common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of child victims of abuse or neglect. *See Open*

Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. 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.). Upon review, we find the information we have marked and indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides 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 is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibits C and D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth of city employees under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the current or former employees timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/gw

Ref: ID# 759084

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)