



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 6, 2008

Ms. Carol Longoria  
Public Information Coordinator  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2008-07755

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 312043.

The University of Texas at San Antonio (the "university") received a request for a copy of documents relating to the investigation of a specified professor which resulted in a termination hearing.<sup>1</sup> You state that you have redacted some of the responsive information pursuant to the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup> The university takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but you state that the release of this information may implicate the privacy rights of certain individuals. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified these individuals of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(d) (permitting interested third party to submit

---

<sup>1</sup>The university sought and received a clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted information.

to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received and considered comments from an attorney (the "attorney") for one of the individuals.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the university has not complied with the time period prescribed by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). To overcome this presumption, the governmental body must show a compelling reason to withhold the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock*, 797 S.W.2d at 381. Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Because the interests of third parties are at stake, we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act.

The attorney raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected by 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). However, information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore is generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 455 (public employee's job performance or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). The university must withhold the medical information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the university may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information from public disclosure based on the common-law right to privacy.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information 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 copyrighted. 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 copyrighted materials, 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, the university must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Olivia A. Maceo  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

OM/mcf

Ref: ID# 312043

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Melissa Ludwig  
San Antonio Express News  
P.O. Box 2171  
San Antonio, Texas 78297-2171  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Javier Maldonado  
Attorney  
1519 West Magnolia Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78201-5441  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Latimer  
Harkins, Latimer & Dahl, P.C.  
405 Saint Mary's Street, Suite 242  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(w/o enclosures)