



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 29, 2006

Ms. Marianna M. McGowan
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd and Joplin, P.C.
Attorneys at Law
P. O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2006-06958

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 253011.

The McKinney Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for three categories of information relating to the application process for a specified position. You state that a portion of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the remaining 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 552.102 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). We will therefore consider your privacy claims under section 552.101 together with your claims regarding section 552.102.

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 the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy 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. *Industrial Foundation*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The types 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. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, this office has found that the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of members of the public are not excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) (absent special circumstances, the home addresses and telephone numbers of private citizens are generally not protected under the Act's privacy exceptions). Upon review, we conclude that the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of common law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (*citing Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After reviewing the submitted information, we find that it does not contain information that is confidential under constitutional privacy; therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on that ground. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Brian J. Rogers
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BJR/krl

Ref: ID# 253011

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Matt Wixon
High School Sports Columnist
Dallas Morning News
c/o Ms. Marianna M. McGowan
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd and Joplin, P.C.
Attorneys at Law
P. O. Box 1210
Mckinney, Texas 75070-1210
(w/o enclosures)