



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 9, 2020

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

OR2020-30832

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# 858763 (Ref. No. P000613-073119).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code. 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* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because sections 552.101, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of these exceptions to the information at issue.<sup>1</sup> However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your claim under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

Next, we note the submitted information includes a court-filed document. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of “information that is also contained in a public court record[,]” unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Austin Chronicle Corp. v. City of Austin*, No. 03-08-00596-CV, 2009 WL 483232 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 24, 2009, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); *see also Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the court-filed document, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will address its applicability to the court-filed document subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Further, we will also address your arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

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 also encompasses information protected by section 411.153 of the Government Code, which provides as follows:

- (a) A DNA record stored in the DNA database is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].
- (b) A person commits an offense if the person knowingly discloses to an unauthorized recipient information in a DNA record or information related to a DNA analysis of a sample collected under this subchapter.
- (c) An offense under this section is a state jail felony.
- (d) A violation under this section constitutes official misconduct.

*Id.* § 411.153. A “DNA record” means the results of a forensic DNA analysis performed by a DNA laboratory. *See id.* § 411.141(6)-(7). “Forensic analysis” is defined as “a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action.” *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 38.35(4); *see also* Gov’t Code § 411.141(10) (providing that “forensic analysis” has meaning assigned by article 38.35). A “DNA database” means “one or more databases that contain forensic DNA records maintained by the director of [the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”)].” Gov’t Code § 411.141(5); *see id.* § 411.001(3).

The director of DPS is required to establish certain procedures for DNA laboratories. *See id.* §§ 411.142(h) (requiring director establish standards for DNA analysis), .144(a). Section 411.144 of the Government Code provides a DNA laboratory conducting a forensic DNA analysis under subchapter G of chapter 411 shall comply with subchapter G and the rules adopted under subchapter G. *See id.* § 411.144(d); 37 T.A.C. §§ 28.81, .82 (describing minimum standards by which forensic DNA laboratory must abide); *see also* Gov't Code § 411.147(b).

Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information is contained in records of a criminal investigation and consists of the results of forensic DNA analyses performed by DNA laboratories in accordance with DPS regulations. Thus, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government also encompasses information made confidential by 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 no portion 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 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 (“TCIC”) 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.” Gov’t Code § 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 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, subchapter F. We note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Additionally, because the laws that govern the dissemination of information obtained from NCIC and TCIC are based on both law enforcement and privacy interests, the CHRI of a deceased individual that is obtained from a criminal justice agency may be disseminated only as permitted by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 565 at 10-12. Upon review, we find the FBI number we have marked constitutes CHRI generated by the FBI, which the city must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code and federal law.

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 found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was

required to withhold the entire report. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). 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 note that 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 Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded”) (quoting Restatement of Torts 2d); *see* 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). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth and the information 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 any of 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. We note the purpose of section 552.130 is to protect the privacy interests of individuals. Because the right of privacy lapses at death, motor vehicle record information that pertains solely to deceased individuals 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, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.130. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the partial credit card number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.153 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the FBI number we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code and federal law. The city must withhold all living public citizens’ dates of birth and the information 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 partial credit card number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/rm

---

<sup>2</sup> We note the remaining information contains social security numbers; however, one of the social security numbers belongs to a deceased individual. Although section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act, this section does not apply to the social security number of a deceased individual. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b). Therefore, the city may only withhold the social security number of the living individual within the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

Ref: ID# 858763

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)