



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 18, 2022

Mr. David Overcash
Counsel for the City of Princeton
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-01385

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 925254 (Ref. No. W027590-101221).

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the requestor's personnel and disciplinary files and audio/video recordings pertaining to the requestor. You state you will redact certain motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, certain social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and certain personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested under chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 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). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes an officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officer's TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

Next, we note the remaining information includes police officers' body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;

- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and
- (3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b). We note the remaining information at issue does not consist of body worn camera recordings. Therefore, the remaining information at issue is not subject to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. Accordingly, we will consider whether the information at issue is otherwise excepted under the Act.

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 protected by other statutes, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act (the “FMLA”). *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states:

[r]ecords and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees’ family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files. . . . If the [Americans with Disabilities Act (the “ADA”)], as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . , except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee’s physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is subject to the FMLA and is confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. We understand none of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to this information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. The ADA provides that a covered entity may require a medical examination after an offer of employment has been made to a job applicant and prior to the commencement of the employment duties of such applicant, and may condition an offer of employment on the results of such examination provided that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be 1) collected and maintained on separate forms, 2) kept in separate medical files, and 3) treated as a confidential medical record. 42 U.S.C. § 12112(d)(3)(B); *see also* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(b); Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). The remaining information contains the results of a pre-employment physical conducted upon a city employee. Upon review, we find the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the information we have marked was used or developed in an investigation conducted under chapter 261 of the Family Code, so as to fall within the scope of section 261.201(a). *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201 of Family Code). You have not indicated the city has adopted a rule governing the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the information we have marked is confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.454 governs the public availability of information submitted to TCOLE under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and provides as follows:

(a) All information submitted to [TCOLE] under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act], unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.

(b) Except as provided by this subchapter, a [TCOLE] member or other person may not release information submitted under this subchapter.

Occ. Code § 1701.454. The remaining information contains F-5 Reports of Separation of Licensee. The information at issue does not indicate the officer at issue resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses. Therefore, the city must withhold the submitted F-5 reports under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which pertains to L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms required by TCOLE. Section 1701.306 provides the following:

(a) [TCOLE] may not issue a license to a person unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a blood test or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCOLE]. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a)-(b). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the submitted L-2 and L-3 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 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 *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). This office has found common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information we have marked for release under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the submitted F-5 reports under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the submitted L-2 and L-3 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.²

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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/jxd

² We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 560.002; *id.* § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

Mr. David Overcash - Page 8

Ref: ID# 925254

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)