



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 29, 2020

Ms. Julie Pandya Doshier  
Counsel for the City of Allen  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
500 North Akard, Suite 1800  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-18882

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 838343 (ORR# W006804).

The City of Allen (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified incident report. The city states it is withholding some of the requested information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.136(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 2018-11817 (2017).<sup>1</sup> The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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 pursuant to section 552.130(e). See *id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. See *id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). See *id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2018-11817 authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general's decision. See *id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides “an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record.” Transp. Code § 730.004. “Personal information” means “information that identifies a person,” and includes a person’s photograph, social security number, driver identification number, name, and address, but does not include a zip code, telephone number, or medical and disability information. *Id.* § 730.003(6). The Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) is an “agency” for purposes of chapter 730. *See id.* § 730.003(1) (“agency” is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records). The city states its police department is an authorized recipient of personal information contained in motor vehicle records maintained by DPS. Accordingly, the city must withhold the personal information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.192 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [DPS] shall disclose to a criminal justice agency information contained in its files and records regarding whether a named individual or any individual named in a specified list is licensed under this subchapter. Information on an individual subject to disclosure under this section includes the individual’s name, date of birth, gender, race, zip code, telephone number, e-mail address, and Internet website address. Except as otherwise provided by this section and by Section 411.193, all other records maintained under this subchapter are confidential and are not subject to mandatory disclosure under the [Act].

(b) An applicant or license holder may be furnished a copy of disclosable records regarding the applicant or license holder on request and the payment of a reasonable fee.

Gov’t Code § 411.192(a)-(b). The information at issue contains concealed handgun license information that the city appears to have obtained from the Department of Public Service, which we have marked. Therefore, the city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000 and makes confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). The city informs us it is part of an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city also states the information it has marked

under section 772.318 was provided to it by a 9-1-1 service supplier. Based on these representations, we agree the city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

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 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). Upon review, we 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 city must 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 city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code exempts 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 (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department’s use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) exempts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory

assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

The city asserts the information it has marked under section 552.108(b)(1) pertains to the gang-member affiliation of an individual and its release would jeopardize the safety of law enforcement officers. Upon review, we find the release of this information would interfere with law enforcement. Therefore, the city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code, section 411.192(a) of the Government Code, and section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(b)(1) 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,

James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jxd

Ref: ID# 838343

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)