



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 31, 2007

Ms. Kelly E. Pagan
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2007-11355

Dear Ms. Pagan:

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#288968.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for e-mails between two named individuals over a particular period of time.¹ You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor's attorney. *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.*

¹We note that the requestor made his request for information on June 4, 2007; however, you explain that the city required the requestor to make a deposit for payment of the anticipated costs in accordance with section 552.263 of the Government Code, and that, on June 21, 2007, the requestor submitted the deposit. *See* Gov't Code 552.263(c) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that the governmental body receives deposit or bond). Thus, we agree that June 21, 2007 is the date the city received this specific request for information.

²We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

§ 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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. *See 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. Additionally, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). In addition, this office has determined that common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978). Furthermore, there is a legitimate public interest in a public employee's work performance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications, work performance, and circumstances of employee's resignation or termination). Upon review, we determine that you have failed to demonstrate that the information at issue constitutes intimate or embarrassing information of which there is no legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note that the submitted information contains information that may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.³ 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 nor provide documentation showing that the employee whose information is at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, if the employee timely elected to keep her personal information confidential, you must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the

³The 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).

Government Code. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee 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 addresses we have marked are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Therefore, the city must withhold the marked e-mail addresses in accordance with section 552.137 unless the city receives consent for their release.

In summary, to the extent the employee at issue timely elected confidentiality, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 unless the city receives consent for their release. The 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Holly R. Davis', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Holly R. Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 288968

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Craig Murrah
240 Crescent Ridge Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76140
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary L. Nichols
Attorney at Law
1701 River Run, Suite 1118
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(w/o enclosures)