



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2016

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2016-17551

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 621593 (Midland Reference No. W019185).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named officer. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which makes tax return information confidential. 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 follows:

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 Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Upon review, we find the submitted W-4 forms are confidential pursuant to section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, and the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.* The ADA provides that a covered entity may require a medical examination after an offer of employment has been made to a job applicant and prior to the commencement of the employment duties of such applicant, and may condition an offer of employment on the results of such examination provided that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be 1) collected and maintained on separate forms, 2) kept in separate medical files, and 3) treated as a confidential medical record. 42 U.S.C. § 12112(d)(3)(B); *see also* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(b); Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). We note the submitted information contains the results of a pre-employment physical conducted upon an employee of the city. Upon review, we find the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Family and Medical Leave Act (the “FMLA”). *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states:

[r]ecords and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees’ family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files. If the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 (GINA) is applicable, records and documents created for purposes of FMLA containing family medical history or genetic information as defined in GINA shall be maintained in accordance with the confidentiality requirements of Title II of GINA (*see* 29

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

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

C.F.R. 1635.9), which permit such information to be disclosed consistent with the requirements of FMLA. If the [Americans with Disabilities Act (the "ADA"), as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . , except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee's physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Further, we find none of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to this information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. 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

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

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 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 at 3-4 (1988), 370 at 2 (1983), 343 at 1 (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 at 1 (1990). However, some of the information you seek to withhold consists of reports of the results of drug tests. Section 159.001 of the MPA defines a “patient” as “a person who, to receive medical care, consults with or is seen by a physician.” Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Because the employee at issue did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug tests, this individual is not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. Upon review, we find the information we have marked is confidential under the MPA. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.⁴ However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is confidential under the MPA. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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[.]”⁵ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court 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. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁶

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts,

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁵The 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).

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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). We note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. ORD 545. We note the payroll deductions for federal withholding tax are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101, but the payroll deductions for social security, mandatory retirement, and Medicare are not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 600 at 9-12 (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5; *see also* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 4 (2007) (public employee's net salary protected by common-law privacy, but gross salary is not).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, it is not clear whether the listed payroll deductions and benefits reflect mandatory participation by the employee or are the employee's voluntary financial decisions. Thus, to the extent this information reflects the employee's voluntary allocation of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, to the extent the information at issue reflects the employee's mandatory participation in the city's retirement program or benefits paid by the city, the deduction amounts are not confidential and may not be withheld on that basis.

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 section 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁷ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) 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. *Id.* § 552.130. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information 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. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, the payroll information we have marked may only be withheld if it reflects the employee's voluntary allocation of salary to optional investment, retirement, and other financial programs offered by the district. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

⁷Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found in article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', written in a cursive style.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 621593

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)