ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 13, 2007

Mr. Scott M. Tschirhart
Earl & Associates, P.C.
111 Soledad, Suite 1111
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2007-04151

Dear Mr. Tschirhart:

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#275753.

The City of Castroville (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests, from two different requestor's, for information pertaining to a specified incident involving District #1 City Councilman and Mayor Pro-tem Hank Seay. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.108 of the Government Code.[1] We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by one of the requestor's and another involved individual. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" *Id.* § 552.102(a). Section 552.102 is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982)

[1]Although you also raise section 552.107 of the Government Code, you have provided no arguments explaining how this exception is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, we will not address this exception. Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

(anything relating to employee's employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person's employment relationship and is part of employee's personnel file). The privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (addressing statutory predecessor). We will therefore consider the applicability of common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claim regarding section 552.102.

In *IndustrialFoundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy 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 a legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. We note that this office has found that the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 542 at 5 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the submitted information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information of which there is no legitimate public interest. Consequently, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under sections 552.101 or 552.102 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 of the Government Code must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the information at issue "could relate to an ongoing criminal investigation." However, you do not inform us that the information at issue does, in fact, relate to an ongoing criminal case. Thus, upon review, we determine that you have failed to establish how release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1).

We note that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.117 of the Government Code.[2] Section 552.117(a)(1) 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 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). However, information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the current or former employee made the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 after the request for information at issue was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). In this case, you do not inform us that the employees whose information is at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, if the employees timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, you must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employees at issue did not make a timely election.

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public" but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address we have marked is not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Therefore, the city must withhold the marked e-mail address in accordance with section 552.137 unless the city receives consent for its release.

In summary, the city must withhold; (1) the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code, to the extent it pertains to a city employee who timely elected confidentiality, and (2) the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor's.

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

---

[2]The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Holly R. Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 275753

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. William Hoover
Anvil Herald Correspondent
260 County Road 4513
Hondo, Texas 78861
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Peterson
1410 Lisbon Steet
Castroville, Texas 78009
(w/o enclosures)