



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2010

Mr. Richard Bilbie
Assistant City Attorney
City of Harlingen
P.O. Box 2207
Tyler, Texas 78551

OR2010-05695

Dear Mr. Bilbie:

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# 377425.

The City of Harlingen (the "city") received a request for a complaint filed by a named city employee against a named municipal judge. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.111 of the Government Code and protected under rule 12 of the Rules of Judicial Administration. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you argue the submitted information is exempt from disclosure under rule 12.5(c), (j) and (k) of the Rules of Judicial Administration. Rule 12 governs the public disclosure of judicial records, which are not subject to the Act. TEX. R. JUD. ADMIN. 12.1, 12.3; Gov't Code §§ 552.003(a)(B), .0035(a). Rule 12.2 of the Rules of Judicial Administration defines a "judicial record" as "a record made or maintained by or for a court or judicial agency in its regular course of business but not pertaining to its adjudicative function[.]" TEX. R. JUD. ADMIN. 12.2(d). In this instance, the submitted information consists of a city employee grievance form. You inform us the submitted information is held in files maintained by the city's personnel department. Because this information was created and is maintained by the city, it does not constitute a judicial record subject to the Rules of Judicial Administration and instead is information subject to the Act. *Id.*, Gov't Code §§ 552.002(a), .003(1)(A)(iii). Rule 12 does not apply to records or information to which access is controlled by the Act.

TEX. R. JUD. ADMIN. 12.3(a)(4). Therefore, as the submitted information is subject to the Act, it may only be withheld if it is excepted from disclosure under an exception in the Act.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, while section 552.102(a) 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) (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). 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(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we will consider your privacy claims under sections 552.101 and 552.102(a) together.

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. 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. The type of information considered intimate or 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. 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). However, information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications and performance and the circumstances of public employee's resignation or termination), 423 at 2 (1984) (explaining that because of greater legitimate public interest in disclosure of information regarding public employees, employee privacy under section 552.102 is confined to information that reveals "intimate details of a highly personal nature"). Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city has failed to demonstrate, however, that any

of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy or section 552.102 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." Gov't Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. See ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

As noted above, the submitted information consists of a communication in the form of a city employee grievance filed by the city's court administrator. This communication pertains to the complaint against the municipal judge. Upon review, we find the submitted information pertains to a routine personnel matter that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/rl

Ref: ID# 377425

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)