



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2020

Mr. Eric C. Ferrar  
Counsel for the City of Jersey Village  
Olson & Olson, LLP  
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2020-11464

Dear Mr. Ferrar:

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# 823959 (Ref. No. JV20-077).

The City of Jersey Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel files of three named police officers and a specified agreement or contract. You indicate you will release some information. You state you will redact information subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001), social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130 and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies to withhold the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. ORD 670 at 6. 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 a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

requested information is excepted from public disclosure. 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* Gov't Code, § 552.301(b). In this instance, you state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the city received the request for information on January 10, 2020. You state the city provided the requestor with a cost estimate pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code on January 21, 2020, and the requestor modified his request on the same day. *See id.* §§ 552.2615 (providing governmental body shall provide requestor with estimate of charges if charges exceed \$40), .222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used). Although you inform us the city received payment from the requestor on January 30, 2020, we note the request is considered to have been received by the city on January 21, 2020, for purposes of calculating the city's deadline to request a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.2615(g) ("The time deadlines imposed by this section do not affect the application of a time deadline imposed on a governmental body under Subchapter G [of the Act]."); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or over-broad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). Accordingly, the city's 10-business-day deadline was February 4, 2020. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until February 13, 2020. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the time requirements of 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, 552.108, 552.130 and 552.137 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.1175, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of these sections for the submitted information.<sup>2</sup> However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

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 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. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1).

---

<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).

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). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c). In this instance, the requestor is not a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted accident reports are confidential under section 550.065(b), and the city must withhold them under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the city to create redacted accident reports that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident reports may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted accident reports. Thus, the city must release the redacted accident reports to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1).

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). 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). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the employees' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.<sup>3</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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has 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) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 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 court of appeals has concluded public citizens'

---

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

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.). We also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees).* Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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 ORD 506 at 5-7.* Thus, to the extent the information we have marked relates to a licensed peace officer who elects 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, the cellular telephone number may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular service. If the individual whose information is at issue is not currently a licensed peace officer or does 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.

You state you will redact certain motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> 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.* Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have redacted and the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 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).

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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

You state you will redact personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684.<sup>5</sup> 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). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). You seek to withhold the private e-mail address of a government employee who used her private e-mail address to conduct official government business. However, in *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.), the court concluded section 552.137 does not except from disclosure the private e-mail addresses of government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business. *See Austin Bulldog*, 490 S.W.2d at 491. Therefore, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the e-mail address at issue is excepted under section 552.137. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the e-mail address you have redacted in the remaining information on this ground.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted accident reports under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code but must release the redacted accident reports pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold the employees’ dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information we have marked relates to a licensed peace officer who elects 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, the cellular telephone number may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have redacted and the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

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,

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/be

Ref: ID# 823959

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)