



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 11, 2020

Ms. Marie N. Johnson
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer Fort McDonald
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2020-19973

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 840170 (ORR# D052120AP).

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. The city indicates it will withhold information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ The city states it has released some of the requested information, but claims some of 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 Code § 552.101. This section 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 represents us it is part of

¹ 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 in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

an emergency communication district that is subject to section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. The city also indicates 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). 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.). We agree the information that the city has marked under common-law privacy satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts 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 release of the submitted firearm serial number, which it has marked, would interfere with law enforcement because the it could be used on an illegal firearm or in a missing weapons report. Upon review, we agree release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, 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 section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code and 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/rm

Ref: ID# 840170

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)