



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 10, 2004

Mr. Bob Ramirez
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
100 Travis Park Plaza Building
711 Navarro
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2004-7753

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 209128.

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any Absence from Duty reports pertaining to a named district employee during a specified time period. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure, in whole or in part, under sections 552.101, 552.102 and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the attorney for the employee in question. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that person may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.102 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* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102 claims together.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation*. In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* 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. 540 S.W.2d at 683. Upon review of the submitted information, we conclude that the information does not contain highly intimate or embarrassing facts which, if released, would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Thus, none of the submitted information can be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.

We next address your claim that some of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117 excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024.¹ Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. The district may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, to the extent that the employee in question made a timely election under section 552.024, the district must withhold the employee's social security number. We have marked this information accordingly.

Even if the employee did not timely elect to keep this information confidential, the employee's social security number may also be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994)*. These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number in the file is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Public Information Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information.

¹ The former home addresses and telephone information of an employee of a governmental body who timely requests confidentiality under section 552.024 are also excepted from disclosure under section 552.117. *See Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994)*.

Prior to releasing any social security number information, you should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the district pursuant to any provision of law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

In summary, you must withhold the marked social security number under section 552.117 if the employee timely elected to keep this information confidential. Even if the employee did not make a timely election, her social security number may still be excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law. You must release all remaining information 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,


Marc A. Barenblat
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAB/jh

Ref: ID# 209128
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tricia Cortez
LMT
111 Esperanza Drive
Laredo, Texas 78041
(w/o enclosures)