



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 31, 2022

Mr. Trey Qualls
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2022-02793

Dear Mr. Qualls:

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# 928490 (Ref. No. E000291-110121).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, the department provides documentation showing it has notified individuals of the right to submit comments to this office why some of the submitted information should not be released.¹ We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it does not pertain to specified incident involving the named individual. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides as follows:

¹ As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any third party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

The medical examiner shall keep full and complete records properly indexed, giving the name if known of every person whose death is investigated, the place where the body was found, the date, the cause and manner of death, and shall issue a death certificate. . . . The records may not be withheld, subject to a discretionary exception under [the Act], except that a photograph or x-ray of a body taken during an autopsy is excepted from required public disclosure in accordance with [the Act], but is subject to disclosure:

- (1) under a subpoena or authority of other law; or
- (2) if the photograph or x-ray is of the body of a person who died while in the custody of law enforcement.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 49.25, § 11(a). Upon review, we find some of the submitted photographs consist of photographs of a body taken during an autopsy. The city does not indicate either of the statutory exceptions to confidentiality is applicable in this instance. Thus, the submitted autopsy photographs are confidential pursuant to section 11 of article 49.25. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 143.090 of the Local Government Code. The city states it is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.090 provides as follows:

A department, [the Fire Fighters' and Police Officers' Civil Service Commission], or municipality may not release a photograph that depicts a police officer unless:

- (1) the officer has been charged with an offense by indictment or by information;
- (2) the officer is a party in a civil service hearing or a case before a hearing examiner or in arbitration;
- (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding;
or
- (4) the officer gives written consent to the release of the photograph.

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

Local Gov't Code § 143.090. The city states the information at issue consists of photographs that depict police officers. The city informs us the police officers depicted in the photographs at issue have not provided the city with written consent regarding the release of the photographs. The city further informs us none of the remaining exceptions under section 143.090 are applicable. Therefore, the city must withhold the submitted photographs of police officers under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.090 of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information ("CHRI") generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that 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(a). 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). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F, of the Government Code. We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one's current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). We also note Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining responsive information consists of CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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). We have further found when a file is created as a result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file referring to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990).

Upon review, we find a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician and information obtained from a patient's medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of medical records for purposes of the MPA, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See 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.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). However, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information

relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004).

Because the information at issue relates to a deceased individual, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue based on the deceased individual's privacy interests. Further, we have not received correspondence from any member of the deceased individual's family asserting a privacy interest in the information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Gov't Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.

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 personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 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). 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 the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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, 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 § 6251 (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”). Therefore, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has not demonstrated 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 responsive 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.³ See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the license plate numbers and issuing states, vehicle identification numbers, and information we have marked and indicated in the remaining responsive information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding 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"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. See Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy number within the remaining responsive information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city must withhold the submitted photographs of police officers under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.090 of the Local Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. 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 and all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the license plate numbers and issuing states, vehicle identification numbers, and information we have marked and indicated in the remaining responsive information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy number within the remaining responsive information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive

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).

information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Katie Stallcup
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AKS/mo

Ref: ID# 928490

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)