



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 10, 2022

Mr. Zac Hatcher
Assistant District Attorney
Wichita County
900 Seventh Street
Wichita Falls, Texas 76301-2482

OR2022-16798

Dear Mr. Hatcher:

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# 953153 (ORR# 02929).

The Wichita County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual, including five specified incidents. We understand the sheriff's office will redact certain information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You assert the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code as interpreted by *Holmes v. Morales*. See 924 S.W.2d 920 (Tex. 1996). In *Holmes*, the Texas Supreme Court held the plain language of section 552.108 did not require a governmental body to show release of the information would unduly interfere with law

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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).

² Although the sheriff's office does not raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in its brief, we understand the sheriff's office to raise this exception based on its markings.

enforcement. *Id.* at 925. The *Holmes* case further held “section 552.108’s plain language makes no distinction between a prosecutor’s ‘open’ and ‘closed’ criminal litigation files” and concluded the Harris County District Attorney may withhold his closed criminal litigation files under that exception. *Id.* Subsequent to the interpretation of section 552.108 in *Holmes*, the Seventy-fifth Legislature extensively amended section 552.108. *See* Act of June 1, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S., ch. 1231, § 1. As amended, section 552.108 now expressly requires a governmental body to explain, among other things, how release of the information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the court’s ruling in *Holmes*, which construed former section 552.108, is superseded by the amended section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048;
or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)-(b). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must reasonably explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). Although you generally assert the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108, you have not specified the subsection of section 552.108 that applies to the information, nor have you submitted any specific arguments explaining how section 552.108 applies to the information. A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You do not inform us the information at issue pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained how its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See Gov't Code* § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). You have not explained how the information at issue pertains to any specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2). Subsection 552.108(a)(3) is also inapplicable as the information at issue does not relate to a threat against a police officer. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(3). Lastly, you do not assert the information at issue was prepared by an attorney representing the state or reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(a)(4) or subsection 552.108(b)(3). Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section 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 id.* § 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 Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information, which we marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.³ However, we note state identification (“SID”) numbers do not constitute confidential CHRI, and the sheriff’s office may not withhold the marked SID number under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *Id.* § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the submitted fingerprints and palm prints under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the fingerprints and palm prints you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Thus, the sheriff’s office must withhold the public citizens’ dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 Fadlo 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).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure;” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found that “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” ORD 185. Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs which identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 428 and 430. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy.

In summary, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The sheriff’s office must withhold the fingerprints and palm prints you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The sheriff’s office must withhold the public citizens’ dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The sheriff’s office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The sheriff’s office 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,

Pearlie Gault
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PG/be

Ref: ID# 953153

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)