



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2004

Mr. Garry D. Minton  
The Law Firm of Garry D. Minton  
P. O. Box 8125  
Jacksonville, Texas 75766

OR2004-7322

Dear Mr. Minton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208321.

The City of Troup (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a "[l]etter ref[er]ring to the propriety of [a named police officer] while in [the city's] employ." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Section 552.301(b) provides that a governmental body that wishes to withhold requested information must "ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the 10th business day after the date of receiving the written request." Gov't Code § 552.301(b). It appears that the city received this request on June 11, 2004. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until June 30, 2004. Thus, the city has failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ)

(governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Because sections 552.101 and 552.102 can provide a compelling reason for withholding information, we will address your arguments. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (presumption of openness overcome by a showing that information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests).

Section 552.101 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. Section 552.102(a) 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102 claims together.

Common-law privacy 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. 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find that a portion of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983) (generally only that information that either identifies or tends to identify victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offenses may be withheld under common-law privacy). We have marked the information the city must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We find, however, that the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing, and further, that the public has a legitimate interest in this information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee’s qualifications and performance and the circumstances of resignation or termination), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101 or 552.102), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under either the constitutional or common-law right of privacy). Accordingly, we find that none of the remaining submitted information may be withheld under common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981). The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 6-7 (1987); *see also Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *reh’g denied*, 770 F.2d 1081 (1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986). This aspect of constitutional privacy involves a balancing of the individual’s privacy interest against the public’s interest in the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987). Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d at 492). After carefully considering your representations and reviewing the remaining information at issue, we find that no portion of the information is protected from disclosure under the constitutional right to privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue, and it 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 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,



Sarah I. Swanson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SIS/krl

Ref: ID# 208321

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Duane Stephens  
2624 Kensington  
Tyler, Texas 75703  
(w/o enclosures)