



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 16, 2019

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
315 South Santa Rosa, Sixth Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78207

OR2019-10162

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 767430 (COSA File No. W256298 & W256302).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to specified incidents involving the requestor's client. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You seek to withhold the identifying information of undercover officers from the submitted information under section 552.152 of the Government Code. Section 552.152 provides,

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required

public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. You represent the release of the undercover officers' identities would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, we find section 552.152 is applicable to the identities of the undercover officers within the information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.152 of the Government Code. However, we find the city has not demonstrated the release of the remaining information you marked would subject an employee to a substantial threat of physical harm. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. 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." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). 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 (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). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1).

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 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.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth we marked 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 license, 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.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.152 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth we marked 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.²

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

¹The 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).

²We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meagan J. Conway', written in a cursive style.

Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MC/jxd

Ref: ID# 767430

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)