



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 25, 2016

Mr. Ryan Mitchell  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Arlington  
P.O. Box 90231  
Arlington, Texas 76004-3231

OR2016-04471

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

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# 599634 (ORR# W024330).

The City of Arlington (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named former officer of the city's police department.<sup>1</sup> You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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 overbroad request for 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>We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because the exceptions you claim can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352. Further, although you claim section 552.1175 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.117 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the city holds the submitted information in an employment capacity.

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 protected by federal law, such as section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. Section 1324a governs I-9 forms and their related documents. This section provides an I-9 form and “any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter” and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the submitted I-9 form in this instance would be “for purposes other than enforcement” of the referenced federal statutes. Accordingly, we conclude the submitted I-9 form and attachments, which we have marked, are confidential pursuant to section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders federal tax return information confidential. *See* 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, 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[.]” *See* 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 Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Thus, the submitted W-4 form, which we have marked, constitutes tax return information that is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (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.

*Id.* § 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)*. We have further found when a file is created as a result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file referring to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” *Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990)*.

Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician and information obtained from a patient's medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the city must withhold the employee's date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision*

---

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

No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, 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), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). This office has also determined a public employee's net pay is protected by common-law privacy even though it involves a financial transaction between the employee and the governmental body. *See* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 3-5 (2007) (net salary necessarily involves disclosure of information about personal financial decisions and is background financial information about a given individual that is not of legitimate concern to public). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). We also note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). We have marked information under section 552.117 that consists of the personal information of a peace officer who was employed by the city and the information is held in the employment context. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the

individual whose information is at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the individual whose information we marked is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is no longer a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, then the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(2).

If the information we marked under section 552.117 pertains to an individual who is no longer a licensed peace officer, then the marked information is subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The submitted documentation reveals the former employee at issue 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. Therefore, to the extent the individual at issue is no longer a peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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). *See* 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 have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold (1) the marked I-9 form and attachments under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code; (2) the marked W-4 form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code; (3) the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA; (4) the employee's date of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code; (5) the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government

Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (6) the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure; (7) the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, to the extent the individual at issue is no longer a peace officer as defined by article 2.12; (8) the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (9) the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 599634

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)