



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

August 29, 2003

Mr. Hollis D. Young
Assistant City Attorney
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-9966

OR2003-6104

Dear Mr. Young:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 186839.

The Community Action Division of the City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for "two folders of information" pertaining to two named individuals and "a record of all other complaints made of other caseworkers within the last year." You state that the city has no record of complaints regarding other caseworkers.¹ You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The Public Information Act (the "Act") does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received, nor does it require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

Initially, we note that the submitted documents contain information that falls within the purview of section 552.022(a)(3). Section 552.022(a)(3) provides that information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body is not excepted from required disclosure unless they are made expressly confidential by law. Therefore, the information we have marked as being subject to section 552.022(a)(3), must be released to the requestor unless it is confidential under other law. As section 552.101 constitutes other law for the purposes of section 552.022, we will address your arguments under this provision for all of 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," and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Information must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy when the information is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, *and* (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Ind. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977).

In prior decisions, we have determined that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) ("In general, we have found the kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to be those regarding the receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities"), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). In this instance, much of the information at issue relates to requests for financial assistance from the community action division of the city with funds provided by the federal government. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we find that the public has a legitimate interest in information pertaining to this type of financial transaction, and conclude that it is not protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records

Decision Nos. 545 at 4, 523 at 4. However, portions of the submitted records consist of background financial information furnished to the city about individuals. This type of personal financial information is confidential, and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 523 at 4. We have marked the personal financial information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You further assert that social security numbers contained in the submitted documents are confidential under common-law privacy. This office has long held that social security numbers are not the type of intimate and embarrassing information protected under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 622 (1994), 455 (1987), 254 (1980), 169 (1977). Therefore, the city may not withhold social security information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note, however, that a social security number may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), if a governmental body obtained or maintains the social security number pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 2-4 (1994). It is not apparent to this office that any social security number contained in the submitted information is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) of the federal law. You have cited no law, and we are aware of no law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990 that authorizes the city to obtain or maintain a social security number. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that any social security number contained in the submitted information was obtained or is maintained pursuant to such a law and is therefore confidential under the federal law. We caution you, however, that chapter 552 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352. Therefore, before releasing a social security number, the city should ensure that it was not obtained and is not maintained pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

You also claim that driver's license information contained in the submitted records is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

The city must withhold the photocopies of Texas driver's licenses under section 552.130.

Finally, we note that the submitted information contains a bank account number. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. The city must, therefore, withhold the marked bank account number under section 552.136.

In summary, we have marked the information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Social security numbers may be confidential under federal law. The city must withhold the photocopies of Texas driver's licenses under section 552.130, and the marked bank account number under section 552.136. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877)673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512)475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

Mr. Hollis D. Young - Page 6

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 186839

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rosa Rosales
Executive Director
National Association of Public Employees
915 Guadalupe Street
San Antonio, Texas 78207
(w/o enclosures)