



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 31, 2020

Ms. Laura Garza Jimenez  
County Attorney  
Nueces County  
901 Leopard, Room 207  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3680

OR2019-34503A

Dear Ms. Jimenez:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-34503 (2019) on December 9, 2019. We have determined the prior ruling should be corrected. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.306, .352. Accordingly, we hereby withdraw the prior ruling. This decision is substituted for Open Records Letter No. 2019-34503 and serves as the correct ruling. *See generally id.* § 552.011 (Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code). This ruling was assigned ID# 815104 (ORR# 19-OR-132).

The Nueces County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information pertaining to a specified address during a specified period of time. The sheriff's office claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions 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). 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. 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.). The sheriff's office must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We also find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the sheriff's office may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines “access device” as “a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). The sheriff's office indicates the submitted badge numbers consist of employee numbers. The sheriff's office informs us its employee numbers can be used, in conjunction with a password, to access its “employee internet[.]” thus granting the user access to sensitive information such as “IRS Forms, W-4 Employee withholding information and elections, employee direct deposit, federal tax withholding information and elections, direct deposit elections and bank account information, etc.” Based on the sheriff's office's representations and our review, we agree its employee numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold all employee numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


In summary, the sheriff's office must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The sheriff's office must withhold all employee numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office 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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/be

Ref: ID# 815104

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)