



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 1, 2005

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan  
School Attorney  
Dallas Independent School District  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2005-09935

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 235610.

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the district's investigative files of two specified peace officers employed by the district. You claim that the submitted information is excepted 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.

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*, 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* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Act. See *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 550 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (citing *Indus. Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976)). Accordingly, we will consider common law privacy claim under both sections 552.101 and section 552.102.

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. *Indus. Foundation*, 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. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: an individual's criminal history when compiled by a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 565 (citing *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989)); 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 assault, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983). Upon review, we find that the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 and common law privacy. However, the public has a legitimate interest in the remaining information and therefore it may not be withheld under section 552.101 and common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 (1992) (information regarding domestic violence not categorically protected by common law privacy), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Section 552.101 also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). 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.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information regarding a peace officer regardless of whether the officer requested confidentiality under section 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117 (a)(2). Thus, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2).

The submitted information also contains Texas motor vehicle record information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that "relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this

state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130. In accordance with section 552.130 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the Texas motor vehicle information we have marked.

In summary, you must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 on the basis of common law privacy. You must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130. All remaining information must 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Lisa V. Cubriel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LVC/jpa

Ref: ID# 235610

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Paulette Johnson  
1255 West Pleasant Run Road #214  
Lancaster, Texas 75146  
(w/o enclosures)