



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 31, 2012

Mr. David C. Schulze
Acting General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, TX 75266-0163

OR2012-08350

Dear Mr. Schulze:

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# 455253.

The Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for "any and all personnel records detailing the training and disciplinary history" of a named employee, including citizen complaints, violations of DART policy, and reprimands.¹ You state DART released some information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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 section encompasses common-law privacy. For information to be

¹You indicate DART sought clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if a large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date the request is clarified or narrowed).

protected from public disclosure by the common-law right of privacy, the information must meet the criteria set out by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. The type 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. *See id.* at 683. This office has found 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). Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy. Although you assert the submitted information is confidential in its entirety pursuant to common-law privacy, we find this is not a situation where all of this information must be withheld to protect any individual's privacy interest.

However, upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, DART must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find that no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate concern to the public. Consequently, DART may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455. The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455

at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, DART may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.² Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). DART may only withhold an employee’s personal information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individual in question elected confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. You do not inform us whether the employee whose information is at issue requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024. Thus, if the employee made a timely election under section 552.024, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. If the employee did not make a timely election under section 552.024, the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the employee whose information is at issue made a timely election under section 552.024, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. 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

² 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).

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 that reads "Sean Opperman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Sean Opperman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SO/som

Ref: ID# 455253

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)