



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 31, 2022

Mr. Trenton M. Dietz
Assistant City Attorney
City of Abilene
P. O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2022-33603

Dear Mr. Dietz:

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# 981763 [ORR 22-1733].

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for a specified internal affairs investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.152 of the Government Code. 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 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). We note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (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).

Upon review, we conclude the information we indicated meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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). You assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts*, 354 S.W.3d 336. The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

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); *see also 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)). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services. However, we find you have failed to establish section 552.117(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(2).

The city seeks to withhold the identifying information of undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. Section 552.152 provides,

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. The city represents the release of the undercover officers' identities would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, we find section 552.152 is applicable to the identities of the undercover officers within the information at issue. Accordingly, the city must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services. The city must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/pt

Ref: ID# 981763

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)