



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 8, 2008

Ms. Alexis M. Goldate
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2008-10825

Dear Ms. Goldate:

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# 318273.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for copies of any statements that prompted a specified investigation and disciplinary meeting against the requestor. You state that the city will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy and excepts from public disclosure private information about an individual if the information (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. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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 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) (information pertaining to illness from severe emotional and job-related stress protected by common-law privacy), 455 (1987) (information pertaining to prescription drugs, specific illnesses, operations and procedures, and physical disabilities protected from disclosure). However, we note that information relating to public employees and public employment is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in public employee's qualifications, work performance, and circumstances of employee's resignation or termination), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

You have marked portions of the submitted information that you seek to withhold pursuant to the common-law right to privacy. However, upon review, we find that none of the information at issue constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). You state that the e-mail addresses you have marked belong to members of the public and are not subject to section 552.137(c). You also state that these members of the public have not affirmatively consented to the release of their e-mail addresses. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. 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 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Katherine M. Krill
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KMK/eeg

Ref: ID# 318273

Enc. Submitted documents