



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 31, 2022

Mr. David Iglesias  
Counsel for Upshur County  
Iglesias Law Firm PLLC  
605 Chase Drive, Suite 8  
Tyler, Texas 75701

OR2022-33757

Dear Mr. Iglesias:

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# 978544 (ORR# P2200301).

The Upshur County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for records pertaining to the in-custody death of a named individual. The sheriff's office claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. Additionally, you inform us the sheriff's office notified the Texas Department of Public Safety's Texas Rangers Division (the "Texas Rangers") of its right to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(17) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[.]" unless it is "made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]" *Id.* § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, section 552.103 of the

---

<sup>1</sup> As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the Texas Rangers.

Government Code, and section 552.108 of the Government Code. We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the court-filed documents may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Additionally, we note sections 552.103 and 552.108 are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the submitted court-filed documents may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with statutory law and constitutional privacy can make information confidential under the Act, we will consider their applicability to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.,* ORDs 531 at 2–3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state some of the submitted information contains detailed footage and depictions of the inside of a county jail and release of the information at issue would reveal sensitive

information pertaining to jail-related security and safety procedures. Based on these representations and our review, we agree the release of some of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may withhold Exhibits 8 through 10 and 17 through 57 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> However, we find you have not demonstrated release of any of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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 section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services ["EMS"] personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(a)-(b), (g). Exhibit 13 consists of an EMS record. Upon review, we find section 773.091 is applicable to the information at issue. Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential and must be released, the sheriff's office must withhold Exhibit 13 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”). At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with HIPAA.

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 further note Federal Bureau of Investigation numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Additionally, because the laws that govern the dissemination of information obtained from NCIC and TCIC are based on both law enforcement and privacy interests, the CHRI of a deceased individual that is obtained from a criminal justice agency may be disseminated only as permitted by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 565 at 10-12. Upon review, we find the information 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.<sup>4</sup> However, we find the sheriff's office has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code, and the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). Section 418.182 provides in part:

(a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Gov't Code § 418.182(a). The fact that information may generally be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 418.182 to the remaining information at issue. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 on that basis.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or

---

<sup>4</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. We note, because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *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). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing to a living individual and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

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. *Id.* 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, 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 were 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 visitor list we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy.<sup>5</sup> However, as previously noted, privacy is a personal right that lapses at death. Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under constitutional privacy. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; ORD 272 at 1. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates a living individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Next, we address the submitted arguments under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

---

<sup>5</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You have not provided this office with evidence any individual had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit to which the sheriff’s office was a party prior to the date the sheriff’s office received the request for information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Thus, we find the sheriff’s office has not established litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the sheriff’s office received the requests for information. Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, we address the submitted arguments under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a governmental body has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. The sheriff’s office informs us the information at issue pertains to an open criminal investigation by the Texas Rangers. However, we have not received correspondence from the Texas Rangers

objecting to the release of the information at issue. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the Texas Rangers.

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.<sup>6</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the license plate information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining materials 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 sheriff's office may withhold Exhibits 8, 9, 10, and 17-57 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g) of the Health and Safety Code, the sheriff's office must withhold Exhibit 13 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. 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. The sheriff's office must withhold the visitor list we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The sheriff's office must withhold the license plate information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the remaining 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->

---

<sup>6</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).

[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/pt

Ref: ID# 978544

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)