



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

April 28, 2008

Mr. Robert J. Davis
Mathews, Stein, Shiels, Pearce, Knott, Eden & Davis, L.L.P.
8131 LBJ Freeway, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75251

OR2008-05682

Dear Mr. Davis:

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# 308763.

Collin County (the "county"), which you represent, received four requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a named individual as well as e-mails exchanged between specified parties during a specified time period. You state that some of the requested information has been provided to the requestor. We note that you have redacted a social security number pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us that some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2007-05358 (2007). With regard to information in the current request that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, the county may continue to rely on the ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release this information in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2007-05358. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body,

¹Section 552.147 authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). For the information not previously ruled upon, we will address the submitted arguments.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, that the county has not complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Governmental Code in requesting this ruling with regard to the remaining responsive information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code, this is a discretionary exception to public disclosure that protects the governmental body's interest and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, we conclude that the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we note that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.² Because these sections can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will address these exceptions.

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 the common-law right of privacy, which 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. *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 met. *Id.* 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. Furthermore, this office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a

²The 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).

governmental body is generally protected by common-law privacy. Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial choices concerning insurance are generally confidential), 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (common-law privacy protects assets and income source information). We have marked the information that the county must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). We have marked information that the county must withhold under section 552.136.

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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. This section does not protect the work e-mail addresses of the employees of an entity with which a governmental body has a contractual relationship. *Id.* § 552.137(c)(1). The submitted information contains e-mail addresses. To the extent that these e-mail addresses are not a government employee’s work e-mail address or are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c)(1), they must be withheld pursuant to section 552.137.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is encompassed by Open Records Letter No. 2007-05358, the county may continue to rely on that previous ruling. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and under section 552.136. To the extent that the submitted e-mail addresses are not a government employee’s work e-mail address or excluded by subsection 552.137(c), they must be withheld pursuant to section 552.137. 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 308763

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Chris Rude
4404 Clifton Lane
McKinney, Texas 75070
(w/o enclosures)
