



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 23, 2020

Mr. Nicholas Toulet
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79702-1152

OR2020-24013

Dear Mr. Toulet:

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# 845301 (City ID #M030715-062920).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for reports and documentation related to city police officers who were suspended during a particular time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted of information.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). Exhibits E and F contain information

pertaining to administrative investigations of city police officers. However, you state this information is related to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions and assert release of that information would interfere with the investigations and prosecutions. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of Exhibits E and F would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to Exhibits E and F.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note Exhibit F contains basic information. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information in Exhibit F, which must be released, the city may withhold Exhibits E and F under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.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.” 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). 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 of the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). Accordingly, the CR-3 accident report in the remaining information is confidential under section 550.065(b), and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). 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, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. 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

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 a violation of criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). 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).

The city states the remaining information contains the identifying information of a complainant who reported possible criminal activities to the city’s police department. Upon review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies a complainant for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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.”³ 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). Accordingly, the city must withhold the employee’s’ date of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, personal pager and cellular telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁵ Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to establish section 552.117(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(2).

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

³ 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).

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

⁵ Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found in article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

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). 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 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 find the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth, which we have 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. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b); see *id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information in Exhibit F, which must be released, the city may withhold Exhibits E and F under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the CR-3 accident report, which we have marked, in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the employee's date of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information

we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information 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.

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/gw

Ref: ID# 845301

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)