



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 4, 2007

Mr. David K. Walker  
County Attorney  
Montgomery County  
207 West Phillips, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2007-06894

Dear Mr. Walker:

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#280066.

The Montgomery County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes education records. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g, of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, education records that are responsive to a request for information under the Act should not be submitted to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). You

---

<sup>1</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og\\_resources.shtml](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og_resources.shtml).

have submitted for our review, among other things, unredacted education records. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions have been made under FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted documents. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority from which you obtained the education records. The department should contact the educational authorities from which education records were obtained and the DOE regarding the applicability of FERPA to such records. However, we will consider your exceptions to the disclosure of the information at issue.

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 chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides for the confidentiality of records created or maintained by a mental health professional. Section 611.002(a) reads as follows:

Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002. Section 611.001 defines a "professional" as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *Id.* § 611.001(b). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only by certain individuals. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Accordingly, we have marked the information that is subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code and may only be released in accordance with sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is highly intimate or embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and the public has no legitimate interest in it. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* include 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.

The submitted information pertains to an investigation of sexual assault. Generally, only the information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy. However, a governmental body is required to withhold an entire report when identifying information is inextricably intertwined with other releasable information or when the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982); *see also* Open

Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld).

In this instance, the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. Thus, withholding only the identifying information of the victim from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. We therefore conclude that the department must withhold the remaining information in its entirety pursuant to the common-law privacy principles incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

In summary: (1) the department should contact the educational authority from which education records were obtained and the DOE regarding the applicability of FERPA to such records; (2) the department must withhold the information we have marked in accordance with sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code; and (3) the department must withhold the remaining information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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).

---

<sup>2</sup>Because our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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,



Holly R. Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 280066

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Curtis W. Fenley, III  
Fenley & Bate, L.L.P.  
224 East Lufkin Avenue  
Lufkin, Texas 75902-0450  
(w/o enclosures)