



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 28, 2019

Ms. Rita Monterrosa  
City of Abilene  
Office of the City Attorney  
P.O. Box 60  
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2019-30415

Dear Ms. Monterrosa:

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# 793705 (ORR# 19-322).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for communications between the city's police chief and employees of the city's police department during a specified time period. The city states it does not maintain information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> We understand the city has released some information. The city argues the submitted information does not consist of public information subject to the Act. The city also claims some the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup> The city also cites to subsection 552.108(a)(2) and section 552.111 of the Government Code in its brief. However, the city has not provided any arguments to support these exceptions. Therefore, we do not address the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301, .302.

<sup>3</sup> We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision* Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, the city argues the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to “public information,” which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body; or

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if it is “created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.” *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

The city informs us the information at issue consists of e-mails and text messages involving the city’s police chief and those below him in rank. The city argues this information was not written, produced, collected, or assembled and is not maintained pursuant to any law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of the city’s business. Upon review, we find some of the information is purely personal in nature and does not concern the business of the city. We understand the city’s policies allow for incidental use of e-mail by employees and officials. Based on the city’s representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the information we marked does not constitute “information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the city. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002. Therefore, we conclude the information at issue does not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records

Decision No. 635 at 7 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Accordingly, the city is not required to release the information we marked in response to the request for information.<sup>4</sup> However, we note the remaining information was created and is maintained by an officer or employee of the city in the officer or employee's official capacity. We further note the remaining information pertains to the city's official business. Accordingly, we find the remaining information was written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained in connection with the transaction of the city's official business. Therefore, we conclude the remaining information is subject to the Act and the city must release it unless the city demonstrates the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the Family and Medical Leave Act (the "FMLA"). *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states:

Records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees' family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files. . . . If the [Americans with Disabilities Act (the "ADA")], as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . , except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee's physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Some of the remaining information, which we marked, consists of a document subject to the FMLA. The information we marked is confidential under section

---

<sup>4</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Further, the city does not indicate any of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to this information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. The city indicates it is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer's civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), the officer's civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer's supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. A letter of reprimand does not constitute discipline under chapter 143. *See* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257. In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113,122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.).

All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are "from the employing department" when they are held by or are in the possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer's misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer's civil service file if the police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department

file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

*Id.* In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See* 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g) to “information reasonably related to a police officer's or fire fighter's employment relationship”); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

The city asserts some of the remaining information is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city states the information at issue “is part of the officer's personnel file.” However, we understand the information at issue is also maintained independently from the department officer's personnel file. The present request does not specifically seek information from any officer's department personnel files. Rather, the requestor seeks communications involving the police chief. The city may not engraft the confidentiality afforded to records under section 143.089(g) to records that exist independently of the internal files. Accordingly, if the information the city marked is maintained solely in the officer's internal personnel file, the information is confidential under section 143.089(g) and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, if the information at issue is also maintained independently of the internal personnel file, the information at issue is not confidential under section 143.089(g) and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 437.232 of the Government Code, which provides as follows:

(a) In this section, “military personnel information” means a service member's name, home address, rank, official title, pay rate or grade, state active duty orders, deployment locations, military duty addresses, awards and decorations, length of military service, and medical records.

(b) A service member's military personnel information is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552.

Gov't Code § 437.232. Section 437.232 is contained in subchapter E of chapter 437 of the Government Code. Chapter 437 is titled “Texas Military” and subchapter E is titled “Texas Military Forces.” Upon review, we find section 437.232 only applies to military personnel

records maintained by the Texas Military Forces. *See id.* § 437.001(14) (providing “Texas military forces” for purposes of chapter 437 mean the Texas National Guard, the Texas State Guard, and any other military forces under state law). We note the information the city seeks to withhold is contained in communications maintained by the city. Thus, section 437.232 is not applicable to the information the city marked, and the city may not withhold that information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 437.232 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise and from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We note section 58.008(b) applies only to law enforcement records that involve a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of juvenile law enforcement records for purposes of section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion 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 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.

*Id.* § 261.201(a). The city argues some of the remaining information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, the city has not established the information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(1). *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

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.”<sup>5</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the city must withhold all public employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.<sup>6</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

---

<sup>5</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).

<sup>6</sup> As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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 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, criminal history information provided by a department officer as part of an application for employment with the department was not compiled by any governmental body. Further, when an officer's criminal history information is compiled in the course of the officer's pre-employment screening, there is a legitimate public interest in the information. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). 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.). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth 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 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov't Code* § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *Open Records Decision No. 676* at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *TEX. R. EVID.* 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *TEX. R. EVID.*

503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The city states some of the remaining information, which it marked, consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). 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 or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city generally states release of some of the remaining information “might hinder the investigation or prosecution of crime.” However, the city does not inform us the information at issue pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor has the city explained its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1) to any portion of the remaining information.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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 or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). 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 or official 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. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(1), and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 Criminal Procedure. As noted above, section 552.117 is applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* ORD 506 at 5-6. Therefore, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(2), and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(11) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a current or former member of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, or Marine Corps, an auxiliary service of one of those branches of the armed forces, or the Texas military forces. Act of May 21, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., H.B. 1351, § 2 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(11)). Section 552.117(a)(11) applies to members of

Texas military forces as defined by section 437.001 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(11), and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(11) 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 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. Upon review, the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information consists of motor vehicle record information for purposes of section 552.130. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.130 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 address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the information we marked does not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code and the city is not required to release the marked information in response to the request for information. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA. If the information the city marked is maintained solely in the officer's internal personnel file, the information is confidential under section 143.089(g) and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public employees' dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked, as well as all public citizens' dates of birth, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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 <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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michelle Garza', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Michelle Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRG/jxd

Ref: ID# 793705

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)