



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 17, 2007

Mr. Ron MacFarlane, Jr.
Dealey, Zimmermann, Clark, Malouf & MacFarlane, PC
3131 Turtle Creek Boulevard, Suite 1201
Dallas, Texas 75219-5415

OR2007-06111

Dear Mr. MacFarlane:

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# 278765.

The City of Cedar Hill (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding the requestor and a named employee. You state that you have released the requested information regarding the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information contains a W-4 form. 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. This section encompasses information that is made confidential by statute. Section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code provides that tax return information is confidential. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(a)(2), (b)(2)(A), (p)(8); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992); Attorney General Op. MW-372 (1981). Accordingly, the city must withhold the W-4 form pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

You claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. 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 Texas 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*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Act.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type 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. You assert that release of the remaining information would violate the named employee’s expectation of privacy. Upon review, however, we find that this information relates solely to this employee’s application and information during employment. Since there is a legitimate public interest in the qualifications of a public employee, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information from public disclosure based on the common-law right to privacy. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee’s qualifications), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.117. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is received. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The city may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was received. In this case you inform us and provide documentation showing that the employee whose records are at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

You claim that portions of the remaining submitted information are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. In relevant part, section 552.130 provides:

(a) Information is excepted from required public disclosure if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Upon review, we agree that you must withhold the Texas-issued motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code

We note that the remaining submitted information contains e-mail addresses. 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 addresses we have marked are not the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individual whose e-mail addresses are at issue consented to release of the e-mail addresses, the city must withhold them in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the W-4 form pursuant to 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 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the Texas-issued motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Unless the individual whose e-mail addresses are at issue consented to release of the e-mail addresses, the city must withhold them in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code. As you do not raise any other exceptions against disclosure, the remaining information must be released.

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,



Jaclyn N. Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JNT/ma

Ref: ID# 278765

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Damion Wyatt
151 North Waterford Oaks Drive
Cedar Hill, Texas 75104
(w/o enclosures)