



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 11, 2022

Ms. Aliceson Cotton  
Counsel for the City of Wylie  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2022-31141

Dear Ms. Cotton:

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# 977427.

The Wylie Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file, disciplinary records, and internal affairs information pertaining to a named individual.<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.122, and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 of the Government Code also encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. *See* Transp.

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the department sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> Although you claim section 552.1175 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.117 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the department holds the submitted information in an employment capacity.

Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator’s accident report), .062 (officer’s accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). Accordingly, the department must withhold CR-3 accident reports under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court has held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the department must withhold department employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the department may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

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 also 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. 600 (1992) (employee’s designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 455 at 9 (employment applicant’s salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transactions between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Further, 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 this office has found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to applicants and employees of

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance, especially where the applicant was seeking a position in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2.

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the current or honorably retired peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2); *id.* § 552.003(1-b) (defining "honorably retired" for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, "family member" means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person's home. *See id.* § 552.117(c) (providing that "family member" has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, including personal cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "a test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]" Gov't Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined that the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes "any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated," but does not encompass evaluations of an employee's overall job performance or suitability. Open Records Decision No. 626 at 6 (1994). The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(b) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of "test items" might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976) (construing statutory predecessor). Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when the answers might reveal the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987); ORD 626 at 8.

The remaining information includes the “Police Officer Selection Test” taken by the named employee. You explain the test is a standard form examination used by the department and release of this information would compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. We agree that the questions and written responses in the “Police Officer Selection Test” qualify as test items under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. Accordingly, we conclude the department may withhold the portions of the “Police Officer Selection Test” we marked under section 552.122 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of test items for the purposes of section 552.122, and no portion of it may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or 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. Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the license plates in the submitted photographs and the information we marked and indicated under section 552.130 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).<sup>4</sup> *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

We note some of the remaining information appears to 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 department must withhold CR-3 accident reports under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. The department must withhold department employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, including

---

<sup>4</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

personal cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The department may withhold the portions of the “Police Officer Selection Test” we marked under section 552.122 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the license plates in the submitted photographs and the information we marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.<sup>5</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,

Michelle Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRG/mo

Ref: ID# 977427

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>5</sup> The information being released contains social security numbers. 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 Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).