



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 6, 2020

Mr. Robert Carroll
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Odessa
P.O. Box 4398
Odessa, Texas 79760-4398

OR2020-12879

Dear Mr. Carroll:

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# 826583 (ID #R000970-021220).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a particular homicide investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ Additionally, you provide documentation showing the city has notified an individual of the right to submit comments to this office as to why some of the submitted information should not be released.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See id.* § 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). Although you state the city

¹ Although you do not raise section 552.108 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to assert this exception based on your arguments.

² As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any interested party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

received the request for information on February 13, 2020, the request for information, which you provided to our office, shows the request for information was sent to the city via e-mail and received during business hours on February 12, 2020. We note the city was closed on February 17, 2020. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was February 27, 2020. However, you submitted the written request for a ruling in an envelope postmarked February 28, 2020. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision from our office.

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, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims section 552.108 of the Government Code for the information at issue. Because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of these sections for the information at issue.³ However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining claimed exception.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 11(a) of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which reads as follows:

The medical examiner shall keep full and complete records properly indexed, giving the name if known of every person whose death is investigated, the place where the body was found, the date, the cause and manner of death, and shall issue a death certificate. . . . The records may not be withheld, subject to a discretionary exception under [the Act], except that a photograph or x-ray of a body taken during an autopsy is excepted from required public disclosure in accordance with [the Act], but is subject to disclosure:

- (1) under a subpoena or authority of other law; or
- (2) if the photograph or x-ray is of the body of a person who died while in the custody of law enforcement.

³ 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).

Crim. Proc. Code art. 49.25, § 11(a). We note Exhibit C contains photographs of a body taken during an autopsy. The autopsy photographs at issue are confidential pursuant to section 11 of article 49.25. We have no indication either of the statutory exceptions to confidentiality are applicable in this instance. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the photographs we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient; is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* § 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Under this definition, a deceased person cannot be a patient under section 159.002 of the MPA. *See* ORDs 487, 370, 343. Thus, the MPA is applicable only to records related to a person who was alive at the time of diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment to which the records pertain. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to section 159.002. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

to the biometric identifiers under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual's biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the city must withhold the biometric identifiers we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information ("CHRI"). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center ("NCIC") or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions." *Id.* § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990); *see generally* Gov't Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except 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. 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). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411. 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. We find the information we have marked consists of CHRI that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.⁶

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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. See Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); cf. Fam. Code § 261.201. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Cf. *U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. 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))). Determinations under common-law privacy must be made on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 373 at 4 (1983); *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685 (whether matter is of legitimate interest to public can be considered only in context of each particular case). 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.). However, 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 Broad. 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 § 652I (1977))); 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"). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, some of this information may pertain to deceased individuals. Therefore, to the extent the information we have marked does not pertain solely to a deceased individual, the city must withhold the information we have marked, along with all identifiable living individuals' dates of birth, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Conversely, the city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy if it only pertains to a deceased individual. Further, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate concern to the public or it pertains solely to a deceased individual. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 and motor vehicle record information pertaining solely to a deceased individual, such as a driver's license, may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229, H-917; ORD 272. Accordingly, with the exception of motor vehicle record information pertaining solely to a deceased individual, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the photographs we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city must withhold the biometric identifiers we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 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 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. To the extent the information we have marked does not pertain solely to a deceased individual, the city must withhold the information we have marked, along with all identifiable living individuals' dates of birth, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of motor vehicle record information pertaining solely to a deceased individual, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 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.

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

Mr. Robert Carroll - Page 7

Ref: ID# 826583

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

1 Third Party
(w/o enclosures)