



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 26, 2012

Ms. Ruth E. Shapiro
Senior Assistant General Counsel
University of Houston System
311 E Cullen Building
Houston, Texas 77204-2028

OR2012-11650

Dear Ms. Shapiro:

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# 460051.

The University of Houston (the "university") received three requests from different requestors for (1) information pertaining to a named individual during a specified period of time, including information relating to promotions; (2) records of all requests or inquiries concerning the named individual received by a specified department and the department's responses; and (3) copies of all similar requests and responses, and a standing request for this information until a specified future date.¹ You state you have released some information to the requestors. You state you will withhold certain information pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 684 (2009) and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the

¹You state the university sought clarification of the requests for information and received clarification from one of the requestors. 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).

Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of this information may implicate the interests of a third party. Accordingly, you have notified the interested third party of the request for information and of her right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the third party explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note one of the requests, in part, seeks information created after the date the request was received. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See id.* §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, as you acknowledge, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the request at issue is documents the university maintained or had a right of access to as of the date that it received the request at issue.

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 information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which makes tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as a taxpayer's "identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income[.]" *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information"

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including W-4 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and access device numbers under section 552.136, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, on September 1, 2011, the Texas legislature amended section 552.136 to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Thus, the statutory amendments to section 552.136 of the Government Code superseded Open Records Decision No. 684 on September 1, 2011. Therefore, a governmental body may only redact information subject to section 552.136(b) in accordance with section 552.136, not Open Records Decision No. 684. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). You assert the submitted information contains tax return information. Upon review, we find none of the information at issue consists of confidential tax return information and, therefore, none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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. *See Indus. Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both elements of the test must be established. *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. In addition, 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). Further, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 600 (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Upon review, we agree a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the university must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and a matter of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 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, 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7. The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions relating to the "zones of privacy"

pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education the United States Supreme Court has recognized. *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" and the scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy. *Id.* at 5 (internal quotations omitted) (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information falls within the constitutional zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

You also raise section 552.102 of the Government Code and assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102 and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 347-48. Upon review, we have marked the information the university must withhold under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information is not excepted under section 552.102(a) and may not be withheld on that basis.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, 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. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.024, .117. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who

³The 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.

made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 that the information be kept confidential. We have marked the information in the submitted documents that may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual at issue did not make a timely election under section 552.024, the university may not withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual at issue did not make a timely election under section 552.024, the university may not withhold the information we 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 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,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 460051

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Elizabeth Warren
24 Linnaean Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
(w/o enclosures)