



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 1, 2006

Mr. Stephen R. Alcorn
Assistant City Attorney
City of Grand Prairie
P. O. Box 534045
Grand Prairie, Texas 75053-4045

OR2006-08505

Dear Mr. Alcorn:

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# 255468.

The City of Grand Prairie (the "city") received a request for information related to animal control service complaints from December, 1, 2005 through May 10, 2006. You indicate that portions of the requested information do not exist.¹ You claim that the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that another statute makes

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received, create information responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by or on behalf of the city. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

²While you cite chapter 143 of the Local Government Code for your argument to withhold information related to a disciplinary action charged against a city employee, we understand you to raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 143 of the Local Government Code, as this section is the proper exception for the substance of your argument.

confidential. You claim that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code.³ Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a firefighter or police officer, including one that must be maintained as part of the employee's civil service file and another that the employer may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g).

You inform us that the information at issue relates to complaints made against an employee of the city's Animal Control Services. You contend that the information at issue is subject to section 143.089(g) and thus, confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Upon review of the submitted information and your arguments, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how section 143.089 of the Local Government Code applies to an employee of the city's Animal Control Services. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.102 excepts from public 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). This exception is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee's employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person's employment relationship and is part of employee's personnel file). The privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101. *See* *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (addressing statutory predecessor).

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Information must be withheld from the public under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy when the information is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, *and* (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See* *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Common-law privacy protects the specific types of information that are held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has since concluded that other types of information are also private under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has held to be private), 470 at 4 (1987) (illness from severe emotional job-related stress), 455 at 9 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 343 at 1-2 (1982) (references in emergency medical records to drug overdose, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illness, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental

³We understand that the city is a civil service municipality under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code.

distress). Based on your arguments and the submitted information, we find that no portion of the submitted information is protected from disclosure by common-law privacy. Thus, you may not withhold any information under either section 552.101 or section 552.102 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute his private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performances or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (statutory predecessor applicable when information would reveal intimate details of highly personal nature), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which employee performed his job cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 400 at 5 (1983) (statutory predecessor protected information only if its release would lead to clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy). 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,



Michael A. Leckmann
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAL/sdk

Ref: ID# 255468

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Pamela Hampton
4230 Illinois Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75211
(w/o enclosures)