



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 25, 2014

Mr. Christopher Gregg
Counsel for the City of South Houston
Gregg & Gregg, P.C.
16055 Space Center Boulevard, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77062

OR2014-12948

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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# 530962.

The City of South Houston (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel files for two specified people. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 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 section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which renders tax return information confidential.¹ See 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:

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]

26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" 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 Chamberlain v. Kurtz*, 589 F.2d 827, 840-41 (5th Cir. 1979); *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted W-4 forms, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.²

Section 552.101 encompasses section 301.081 of the Labor Code, which governs the release of employment information held by the Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission"). Section 301.081 provides in pertinent part as follows:

(a) Each employing unit shall keep employment records containing information as prescribed by the commission and as necessary for the proper administration of this title. The records are open to inspection and may be copied by the commission or an authorized representative of the commission at any reasonable time and as often as necessary.

(b) The commission may require from an employing unit sworn or unsworn reports regarding persons employed by the employing unit as necessary for the effective administration of this title.

(c) Employment information obtained or otherwise secured under this section may not be published and is not open to public inspection, other than to a public employee in the performance of public duties, except as the commission considers necessary for the proper administration of this title or as provided by commission rule and consistent with federal law.

Labor Code § 301.081(a)-(c). The documents we have marked reflect that the city obtained certain employment information from the commission. Records that are confidential in the hands of the originating governmental body remain confidential when transferred to another

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against the disclosure of this information.

governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 674 at 4 (2001), 667 at 4 (2000); *see also* Attorney General Opinion H-836 (1976) (governmental bodies have need to maintain unrestricted flow of information, to effectuate state policy that governmental bodies cooperate in the efficient and economical administration of statutory duties). Accordingly, the submitted information we have marked is confidential under section 301.081 of the Labor Code while in the custody of the commission. Section 301.081 does not prevent transfer of the information to the city. Thus, pursuant to the intergovernmental transfer doctrine, we conclude the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 301.081 of the Labor Code.³

You raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”). At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent that such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See id.* § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against the disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records.⁴ Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in part, as follows:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982)*. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987)*. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial

⁴ You raise section 5.08(b) of article 4495(b) of Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes. We note that the MPA formerly appeared in Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes as article 4495b, section 5.08(b). The Seventy-Sixth Legislature repealed article 4495b and codified the MPA in the Occupations Code.

transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefit programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). However, this office has also noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We find the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing information or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy protects information if it (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.*, 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 of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having carefully reviewed the submitted information, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. We find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, 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. 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). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who 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. To the extent the employees at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. If the employees did not make a timely election under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁵

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). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner consents to its release.

In summary, the city must withhold the 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. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 301.081 of the Labor Code. The city must the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the marked date of birth information under section 552.102 of the Government Code. To the extent the employees at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner consents to its release. 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.

⁵ We note, regardless of the applicability of section 552.117, 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 an attorney general decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rustam Abedinzadeh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RA/eb

Ref: ID# 530962

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)