



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 31, 2019

Mr. Brian S. Nelson
General Counsel
Corpus Christi Independent School District
P.O. Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-0110

OR2019-21077

Dear Mr. Nelson:

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# 778178.

The Corpus Christi Independent School District Police Department (the "department") received a request for information related to a specified traffic accident involving the requestor's clients. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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, 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). 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. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports,

financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. Department 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 requestor has a right of access to the date of birth of his clients pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.023(a)* (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 the 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, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, the department failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the department may not withhold any of it on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)*; Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). However, section 552.117 applies only to records that a governmental body holds in an employment capacity. *See Open Record Decision Nos. 532 (1989)* (purpose of predecessor to section 552.117 is to protect certain information during and after employment relationship), 530 (1989) (discussing interplay between sections 552.024 and 552.117), 455

(1987). The information at issue constitutes records the department maintains in a law-enforcement capacity, and not in an employment capacity. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.¹ *Id.* § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to his clients' motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from him under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD No. 481 at 4 (1987). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information consists of motor vehicle record information. Accordingly, with the exception of information belonging to the requestor's clients, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked in the submitted reports under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”² Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the marked motor vehicle record information in the submitted reports under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must

¹ The department seeks to withhold information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). However, that previous determination was superseded by the amendments to section 552.130 by the 82nd Legislature in 2011. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.130 (authorizing the redaction of certain information without a decision from this office and requiring notice be provided to requestor). Therefore, the commission must comply with the requirements of section 552.130 when redacting information that falls within the protections of those statutes, not Open Records Decision No. 684. 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).

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).

withhold the insurance policy numbers within the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The department 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,



Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/eb

Ref: ID# 778178

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.