



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 25, 2019

Ms. Brittaney N. Davis  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2019-26880

Dear Ms. Davis:

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# 784639 (City PIR No. W086624).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for a specified investigation file. You state the city has released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). You state the city received the request for information on June 14, 2019. The city does not inform us it was closed for any business days between June 14, 2019 and June 28, 2019. Accordingly, the city was required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by June 28, 2019. However, the envelope in which the city provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked July 1, 2019. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or

---

<sup>1</sup> We note although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the city's arguments under this exception against release of the submitted information. Further, sections 552.1175, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, we will address the applicability of these sections to the submitted information. However, we find the city has failed to establish a compelling reason to address its remaining claimed exception.

Next, we note the submitted information includes search warrants and search warrant returns, which are court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[.]" unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Austin Chronicle Corp. v. City of Austin*, No. 03-08-00596-CV, 2009 WL 483232 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 24, 2009, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); *see also Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the city may not withhold information contained in the court-filed documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will address its applicability to the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Further, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the

---

<sup>2</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

“zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual’s privacy interest against the public’s interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

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.” ORD 185. 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. We have determined the same principles apply to an inmate’s recorded conversations from a telephone at a jail. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. 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). In this instance, the submitted information includes audio recordings of an inmate’s telephone conversations. Upon review, we find this information is confidential under constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal

---

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

regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that 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 section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one’s current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *See id.* § 411.082(2)(B). We further note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Additionally, because the laws that govern the dissemination of information obtained from NCIC and TCIC are based on both law enforcement and privacy interests, the CHRI of a deceased individual that is obtained from a criminal justice agency may be disseminated only as permitted by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See ORD 565 at 10-12.* Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.<sup>4</sup>

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. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual’s criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf.*

---

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

Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). However, the public has a legitimate interest in knowing the details of a crime. *See Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting a "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* ORD 455. 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. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Because "the right of privacy is purely personal[.]" that right "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]" *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 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 § 6521)); 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").

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, in the information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth, as well as the information we have marked and indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides,

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

(1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;

- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

Occ. Code § 1703.306(a), (b). The remaining information contains information acquired from a polygraph examination. The requestor does not fall within any of the categories of individuals who have a right of access to the submitted polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the polygraph information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.153(a) of the Government Code, which provides “[a] DNA record stored in the DNA database is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under the [Act].” Gov’t Code § 411.153(a). A “DNA record” means the results of a forensic DNA analysis performed by a DNA laboratory. *See id.* § 411.141(6)-(7). “Forensic analysis” is defined as “a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action.” Crim. Proc. Code art. 38.35(4); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.141(10) (“forensic analysis” has meaning assigned by article 38.35). A “DNA database” means “one or more databases that contain forensic DNA records maintained by the director of [DPS].” Gov’t Code § 411.141(5); *see id.* § 411.001(3).

The director of DPS is required to establish certain procedures for DNA laboratories. *See id.* §§ 411.142(h) (requiring director establish standards for DNA analysis), .144(a). Section 411.144 of the Government Code provides a DNA laboratory conducting a forensic DNA analysis under subchapter G of chapter 411 must comply with subchapter G and the rules adopted under subchapter G. *See id.* § 411.144(d); 37 T.A.C. §§ 28.91, .92 (describing minimum standards by which forensic DNA laboratory must abide); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.147(b).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of records relating to DNA analyses of samples collected under subchapter G of chapter 411 of the Government Code. We further note this information is the result of forensic DNA analyses performed by a DNA laboratory in accordance with DPS regulations.

Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153(a) of the Government Code. *See City of Fort Worth v. Abbott*, 258 S.W.3d 320, 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2008, no pet.) (section 411.153 prohibits release of DNA records held by city forensic science laboratory regardless of whether records have been forwarded to DPS state DNA database).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 414.007 of the Government Code, which reads as follows:

A record relating to a tip received under Section 414.0015(a) maintained by the [Texas Crime Stoppers Council], a crime stoppers organization, a law enforcement agency, a school district, or an open-enrollment charter school, including the identity of the person who submitted the tip, is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552.

Act of May 27, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., H.B. 3316, § 6 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 414.007). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is a tip made to a crime stoppers organization pursuant to section 414.0015 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 1 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 414.001(2)(B)) (defining “crime stoppers organization”); *see also id.* § 2 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 414.0015) (establishing procedures for accepting and forwarding crime stoppers tips). Therefore, the information we have marked is confidential under section 414.007 of the Government Code. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 414.007 of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Section 552.1175 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988)* (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Thus, to the extent the information we have marked and indicated relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular service. If the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers or do not elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects privacy interests. As previously discussed, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229, H-917; ORD 272. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) 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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. In the information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth, as well as 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 polygraph information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 414.007 of the Government Code. To the extent the information we have marked and indicated relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with

section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular service. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.<sup>5</sup>

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/be

Ref: ID# 784639

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>5</sup> We 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 an attorney general decision under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).