



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 15, 2004

Mr. Juan P. Reyna, P.C.
Attorney & Counselor at Law
P.O. Box 2067
Alice, Texas 78333-2067

OR2004-7897

Dear Mr. Reyna:

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# 209213.

The City of Alice (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for records pertaining to sexual harassment complaints made against a specified individual and the personnel files of two named individuals. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 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. Sections 552.301(a) and (b) provide:

(a) A governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold from public disclosure and that it considers to be within one of the [Act's] exceptions . . . must ask for a decision from the attorney general about whether the information is within that exception if there has not been a previous determination about whether the information falls within one of the exceptions.

(b) The governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request.

Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). You state that the city received this request for information on June 23, 2004. Therefore, you were required to submit your request for a decision from this office no later than July 7, 2004. Your request for a decision bears a post office cancellation mark indicating it was mailed on July 8, 2004. Consequently, we find that you failed to request a decision within the ten-business-day period mandated by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308(a) (ten-day requirement met if request bears post office cancellation mark indicating time within ten-day period).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of 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). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body. Thus, section 552.103 does not demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information from the public. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103. However, because your claim under section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of this exception to the submitted information.

You assert that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. Common-law privacy protects information that (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. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); 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); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We note, however, that the right of privacy is purely personal and lapses upon death. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enterprises Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984); H-917 (1976).

Upon review, we find that most of the information you seek to withhold under section 552.101 is not highly intimate or embarrassing for the purpose of common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 622 at 2 (1994) (social security numbers are not protected by common-law privacy); 455 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers of private citizens generally not protected under privacy exceptions of Act). Additionally, 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). We have marked the information that is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101. We note that some of the submitted documents relate to allegations of sexual harassment. Pursuant to *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the city must also withhold the identities of the victims of sexual harassment under section 552.101 and common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. The submitted documents include W-4 tax forms. Prior decisions of this office have held that section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Tax return information is defined as data furnished to or collected by the IRS with respect to the determination of possible existence of liability of any person under title 26 of the United States Code for any tax. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b). We determine that the submitted W-4 forms are tax return information and are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 as information made confidential by federal law.

The remaining submitted documents also include Employment Eligibility Verifications, Forms I-9. Form I-9 is governed by section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code, which provides that an I-9 form and “any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter” and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the Forms I-9 in this instance would be “for purposes other than for enforcement” of the referenced federal statutes.

Accordingly, we conclude that these documents and the information attached thereto are confidential and may only be released in compliance with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system.

The remaining submitted information also includes a medical record, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in pertinent part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002. Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). This office has also concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Medical records must be released upon the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The submitted medical record, which we have marked, may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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 timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is received by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who elected to keep information confidential pursuant to section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was received by the city. The submitted documents include election forms for two of the employees at issue that were completed prior to the date the city received the present request. Therefore, the city must withhold the information pertaining to these two individuals, which we have marked,

under section 552.117(a)(1). The submitted information does not indicate that the remaining information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) pertains to employees who have elected to withhold personal information pursuant to section 552.024. If these employees did make such an election prior to the city's receipt of the present request, then the city must withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The city may not withhold this information for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

The submitted documents also contain Texas driver's license numbers that are subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a Texas motor vehicle driver's license and information relating to a Texas motor vehicle title or registration. Gov't Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the Texas driver's license numbers we have marked under section 552.130.

The submitted information also contains e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides in part:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Gov't Code § 552.137(a), (b). Section 552.137 excepts certain e-mail addresses of members of the public who have not affirmatively consented to the release of the e-mail addresses. Section 552.137(c) provides certain conditions under which e-mail addresses of members of the public are not excepted from disclosure, which are not applicable here. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(c) (e-mail address provided by contractor or vendor, contained in bid proposal, or on letterhead or document available to public generally not excepted under section 552.137). Further, section 552.137 does not apply to the work e-mail addresses of officers or employees of a governmental body, a website address, or the general e-mail address of a business. Unless the relevant individuals have affirmatively consented to the release of these e-mail addresses, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137(a).

Finally, we note that one of the remaining submitted documents is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental

body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold the marked medical record pursuant to the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with (1) the doctrine of common-law privacy, (2) section 6103(b) of title 26 of the United States Code, and (3) section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) if it pertains to an employee who made a timely election pursuant to section 552.024. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 unless it has received affirmative consent for their release. The copyrighted document must be released in compliance with applicable copyright law. The remaining submitted information must also be released.

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,



Amy D. Peterson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 209213

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Christopher Maher
Alice Newspapers, Inc.
P.O. Box 1610
Alice, Texas 78332
(w/o enclosures)