



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 21, 2022

Mr. Daniel Sylvia
Counsel for the City of Dayton
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
1517 Trinity Street
Liberty, Texas 77575

OR2022-39849

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

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# 991822.

The City of Dayton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a particular incident, as well as personnel records pertaining to the responding officers. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes officers' Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification numbers. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officers' TCOLE numbers do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officers' TCOLE numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.¹

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, 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). The information at issue contains an administrative use of force report. We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). However, you state the information you indicated is related to a pending criminal investigation and assert release of that information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus,

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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. The submitted information includes an L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition form required by TCOLE. This form is confidential under section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which is encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 1701.306 provides the following:

(a) The commission may not issue a license to a person unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a blood test or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to the commission. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a)-(b). Therefore, the city must withhold the submitted L-2 declaration form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.³

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). We understand you to 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. This exception encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex.*

² As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

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

Indus. Accident Bd., 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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 v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). 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 the city must withhold the dates of birth of the employees at issue under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁴ However, none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a), and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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). Although we have concluded a compilation of a private individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and is generally not of legitimate concern to the public, criminal history information compiled by a law enforcement agency in the process of hiring a peace officer is a matter of legitimate public interest. Cf. *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. See Open Records Decision Nos. 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); 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We note the fact that a public employee is sick is public information, but specific information about illnesses is excepted from disclosure. See ORD 470 at 4. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). This office has also determined that a public employee's net pay is protected by common-law privacy even though it involves a financial transaction between the employee and the

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

governmental body. *See* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 3-5 (2007) (stating that net salary necessarily involves disclosure of information about personal financial decisions and is background financial information about a given individual that is not of legitimate concern to the public). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy).

Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁵ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 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); *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). We note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We also note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). We further note section 552.117(a)(2) is not applicable to a former spouse and does not protect the fact that a peace officer has been divorced. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.⁶ Upon review, however, we find you have failed to

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(2), and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

Section 552.1175 protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. *See* Gov't Code § 552.1175. We note, for purposes of section 552.1175, "family member" means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person's home. *Cf. id.* § 552.117(c). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "current or honorably retired peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *See id.* § 552.1175(a)(1); *see also id.* 552.003(1-b). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* ORD 506 at 5-6. Accordingly, to the extent the information we have marked relates to an individual subject to section 552.1175 who elects to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. However, we find you have failed to establish section 552.1175 is applicable to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1175.

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.⁷ *See* Gov't Code. § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the officers' TCOLE numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth of the employees at issue under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the submitted L-2 declaration form under section 552.101 of the Government

⁷ 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.

Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. To the extent the information we have marked relates to an individual subject to section 552.1175 who elects to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city 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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/pt

Ref: ID# 991822

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)