



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2020

Mr. Ryan Brooke
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2020-06423

Dear Mr. Brooke:

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# 814060 (Ref. No. 2637).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified case. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the requestor has specifically excluded from his request for information dates of birth, social security numbers, and motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Therefore, these types of information are not responsive to the present request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to the present request.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." *Id.*

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

§ 552.101. This section 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. 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. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transactions between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, we note the public has a legitimate interest in the details of a crime. *See* Open Records Decision No. 400 at 4 (1983); *see generally* *Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity” (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (5th Cir. 1994))). We also note an individual’s name, address, and telephone number is generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person’s name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy).

Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s

privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2. Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660, 665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You assert some of the remaining responsive information identifies complainants who reported violations of law to the city. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the city for purposes of the informer's privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator's accident report), .062 (officer's accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). Accordingly, the city must withhold the accident report we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides that "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." Gov't Code § 560.003; *see also id.* §§ 560.001(1) (defining "biometric identifier" to include fingerprints), .002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual's biometric identifier to another person unless individual consents to disclosure), .003 (biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body exempt from disclosure under the Act). You do not inform us, and the information at issue does not indicate, section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint information, which we marked, in this instance. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted fingerprint information we marked under

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 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.”² *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold all insurance policy numbers within the remaining responsive information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to 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 marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city must withhold: (1) the accident report we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code; (2) the submitted fingerprint information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code; and (3) all insurance policy numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

² The 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).

Mr. Ryan Brooke - Page 5

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 "Blake Brennan", written in a cursive style.

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/be

Ref: ID# 814060

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)