



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 23, 2012

John J. Janssen, J.D., Ph.D.  
General Counsel  
Corpus Christi Independent School District  
P.O. Box 110  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-0110

OR2012-04319

Dear Dr. Janssen:

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# 448449.

The Corpus Christi Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all e-mails between the district superintendent and all district trustees from August 2011 to the date of the request.<sup>1</sup> You state you will make almost all of the requested information available to the requestor. We understand you to claim that the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to

---

<sup>1</sup>You note that the district sought and received a clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Although you did not specifically raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to claim this section based on your submitted arguments.

section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, the governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state the district received the request for information on December 6, 2011. You inform our office the district was closed December 19, 2011 through January 2, 2012. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Thus, the district's ten- and fifteen-business-day deadlines were January 4, 2012, and January 11, 2012. You state you informed the requestor the requested information would not be available until January 11, 2012. However, we note the deadlines prescribed by section 552.301 are fixed by statute and cannot be altered by agreement. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (obligations of a governmental body under predecessor to Act cannot be compromised simply by decision to enter into contract), 514 at 1-2 (1988). You did not request a ruling or submit information for our review until January 12, 2012. Accordingly, we find the district failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007, Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1997) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Thus, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108. We understand the district to raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for a portion of the submitted information. Because section 552.101 of the

Government Code can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under this exception.

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 common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. The types 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. *See id.* at 683. Upon review, we find that no portion of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the information at issue contains a personal e-mail address subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> 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). The e-mail address contained in the information at issue is not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, this e-mail address, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release.<sup>4</sup> *See id.* § 552.137(b). As no further exceptions are raised, 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>4</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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](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,

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

Vanessa Burgess  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 448449

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)