



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 6, 2009

Ms. YuShan Chang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2009-00116

Dear Ms. Chang:

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# 331524.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for twenty categories of information pertaining to the William A. Lawson Institute for Peace and Prosperity ("WALIPP"). You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.136, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code. You also state that releasing some of the submitted information may implicate the interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified WALIPP and The Gerald A. Teel Company, Inc. ("Teel") of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

released. Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, WALIPP and Teel have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information pertaining to them should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to WALIPP and Teel would implicate their proprietary interests and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret).

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 552.101 also encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held that section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as "a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of income, payments, tax withheld, deficiencies, over assessments or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Internal Revenue Service] with respect to a return . . . or the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability. . . for any tax, . . . penalty, . . . , or offense[.]" *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Upon review, we find that the submitted information does not contain tax return information; therefore, none of the submitted information is confidential under section 6103(a), and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note you have marked, among other things, information pertaining to WALIPP as excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate

and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), rev'd on other grounds, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy). Upon review, we find that the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city has failed to demonstrate, however, how the remaining information it has marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, 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 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected under section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). We note, however, that section 552.117 only applies to records that the governmental body holds in its capacity as an employer. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117 (providing that employees of governmental entities may protect certain personal information in the hands of their employer). In this instance, the information you have marked under section 552.117 is not contained in records that the city holds in its capacity as an employer. Thus, the information you have marked under section 552.117 may not be withheld on this basis.

We note that the submitted documents contain information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.² Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure "information [that] relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state[.]" *Id.* § 552.130(a)(1). Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas driver's license number we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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." *Id.* § 552.136. Accordingly, we find that the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers and bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

The remaining information contains e-mail addresses that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code, which requires a governmental body to withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You inform us that the owners of the e-mail addresses have not affirmatively consented to their release. Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under: (1) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) section 552.130 of the Government Code; (3) section 552.136 of the Government Code; and (4) section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.³

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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).

³We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code 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.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 331524

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cheryl Lawson
WALLIP Seniors Residence
5220 Scott Street
Houston, Texas 77004
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerald A. Teel, MAI, CRE
The Gerald A. Teel Company, Inc
974 Campbell Road, Suite 204
Houston, Texas 77024
(w/o enclosures)