



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

April 29, 2008

Ms. Amanda M. Bigbee
Henlsee Schwartz, L.L.P.
306 West 7th Street, Suite 1045
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-05716

Dear Ms. Bigbee:

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# 308810.

The Little Elm Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all records from March 1, 2006 through February 13, 2008 concerning the requestor. You state that some of the requested information has been provided to the requestor. You indicate that the district is redacting some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a).¹ You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.135, and 552.137 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*, 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 v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976).

¹We note that our office is prohibited from reviewing the education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made; therefore, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted information.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure 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. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* includes 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. You contend that the authors of some e-mails are "highly personal and intimate," the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and not of legitimate public interest. We note, however, that there is a legitimate public interest in the qualifications of a public employee and how that employee performs job functions and satisfies employment conditions. See Open Records Decision No. 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). Upon review, we find that the names of people who shared information about a teacher are not highly intimate and embarrassing information. Accordingly, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.102.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) "Informer" means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's or persons' possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer's name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.135(a), (b). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of "law," a school district that seeks to withhold information under this exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. See *id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). You claim that the identifying information of certain individuals should be protected from disclosure because they purportedly reported possible violations of law to the district. We note, however, that these individuals are members of the public. We, therefore, find that you have failed to demonstrate how the reporting parties are informants as defined by section 552.135(a). Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on this basis.

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). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work email 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 do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individuals whose e-mail addresses are at issue consented to release of their e-mail addresses, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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 "Henisha D. Anderson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

Henisha D. Anderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HDA/mcf

Ref: ID# 308810

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Anita Riley
1417 Knottingham Drive
Little Elm, Texas 75068
(w/o enclosures)