



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

March 20, 1996

Ms. Sandra C. Joseph
Open Records Counselor/Disclosure Officer
Comptroller of Public Accounts
LBJ State Office Building
P.O. Box 13528
Austin, Texas 78711-3528

OR96-0367

Dear Ms. Joseph:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 39206.

The Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "Comptroller") received a request for a copy of a certain letter and any other correspondence by Mary Clark concerning the requestor. You state the you have provided the requestor with most of the requested information. However, you claim that portions of one letter are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claimed and have reviewed the document at issue.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy excepts from disclosure private facts about an individual. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Information may be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 (1992) at 1. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

The constitutional right to privacy protects two interests. Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) at 4 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) at 4. The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.*


The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) at 5-7 (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common law; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)).

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under constitutional or common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse or the detailed description of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have reviewed the document submitted for our consideration and have marked the information that must be withheld under constitutional or common-law privacy.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to the home address, home telephone number, and social security number of a current or former government employee or official, as well as information revealing whether that employee or official has family members. Section 552.117 requires you to withhold this information for an official, employee, or former employee who requested that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 622 (1994), 455 (1987). You may not, however, withhold this information if the employee had not made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 at the time this request for the documents was made. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. Open Records Decision No. 530 (1989) at 5.

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Stacy E. Sallee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SES/ch

Ref.: ID# 39206

Enclosures: Marked document

cc: Ms. Myrna Cedars
(w/o enclosure)