



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 5, 2020

Ms. Katie Leininger
Assistant City Attorney
City of Pearland
3519 Liberty Drive
Pearland, Texas 77581

OR2020-24992

Dear Ms. Leininger:

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# 848061.

The City of Pearland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named officer. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.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. This section encompasses section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. The city states it is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files: a police officer's civil service file that the civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file that the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code

¹ We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

§ 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a).² *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer's misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under the Act. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

The city informs us Exhibit B pertains to an investigation that did not result in disciplinary action against the officer at issue. The city states this information is maintained in the police department's internal files concerning the named officer. Based on these representations and our review of the documents at issue, we agree this information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g). Therefore, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Upon review, we find Exhibit C consists of a mental health record that is subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, the city must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.

² Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-.055.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

(1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee[.]

(b) The city or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

Occ. Code § 1703.306(a)(1), (b). Exhibit F consists of polygraph information that is confidential under section 1703.306. The requestor does not appear to have a right of access to the information under that section. Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations 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.). Nevertheless, 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 § 6521 (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”). This office has also found the public has a legitimate interest in information

relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job). In addition, this office has found the public has a legitimate public interest in the details of a crime. *See* Open Records Decision No. 400 at 4 (1983). *See generally* *Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity” (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). The city must withhold the submitted dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We also find Exhibit E satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must also withhold Exhibit E 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 552.130 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.³ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the submitted driver’s license and license plate numbers and issuing state under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the following: (1) Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code; (2) Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code; (3) Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code; (4) the submitted dates of birth of living individuals and Exhibit E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (5) the submitted driver’s license and license plate numbers and issuing state 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->

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

[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/mo

Ref: ID# 848061

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)