



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 3, 2009

Mr. Warren M.S. Ernst  
Chief, General Counsel Division  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2009-10731

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 350817.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named employee, including internal affairs investigations and disciplinary actions. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.114, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. Although you seek to withhold attorney work product under section 552.103, which can encompass such information, section 552.111 is the appropriate exception under which to claim the attorney work product privilege itself. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 2-4 (2002). Further, because you provide no supporting arguments explaining why this exception is applicable to the information at issue, the city has waived its claim under this exception. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

Initially, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a), does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental 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>2</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records 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 have submitted, among other things, unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, we do not address your arguments under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), 552.114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). However, to the extent you determine the information you have submitted is not protected by FERPA, we will consider your other arguments against disclosure.

We note that you have redacted information from the submitted documents. You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, that you have been authorized to withhold any of the redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). Because we can discern the nature of the information that has been redacted, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling in this instance. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering that the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested" or representative sample), .302.

Next, we note that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

---

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup>In the future, if the city does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records and the city seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

(a) the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

*Id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted records contain completed investigations and employee evaluations; all of this information is expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(1). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103. However, because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.136, we will address the city's arguments under these exceptions for that information. We will also consider the city's claims regarding the information not subject to section 552.022.

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. Mental health records are confidential under section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(a) 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.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see also id.* § 611.001 (defining "patient" and "professional"). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code provide for access to information that section 611.002 makes confidential only by certain individuals. *See id.* §§ 611.004, .0045; Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). We have marked the information subject to section 552.022 that is confidential under section 611.002 of the

Health and Safety Code and that must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Some of the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure based on the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. 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 some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). This office has also 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). 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 under section 552.101 of the Government Code pursuant to common-law privacy.

You also raise section 552.117 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure of portions of the information subject to section 552.022. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former 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 of the Government Code. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by 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). Therefore, 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 made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the city must withhold the employees' home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and any information that reveals whether these employees have family members. The city may not withhold this information under

section 552.117 for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.<sup>4</sup>

You assert that the employee identification numbers you have marked are confidential under section 552.136(b) of the Government Code, which 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. You inform us that an employee’s identification number is also used as an employee’s credit union bank account number. Thus, we agree that this information is subject to section 552.136. Therefore, the city must withhold the information otherwise subject to section 552.022 that you have marked, and the additional information that we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your arguments against the disclosure of the remaining information, which is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

*Id.* § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d

---

<sup>4</sup>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. Gov’t Code § 552.147. Thus, if section 552.117(a)(1) does not apply to the marked social security numbers, the city may withhold the social security numbers under section 552.147(b).

n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, that prior to the city's receipt of this request, a lawsuit styled *Leanne Siri v. City of Dallas*, Cause No. 09-04875, was filed in the District Court of Dallas County, Texas, A-14th Judicial District. Accordingly, we find that litigation was pending when the city received this request for information. Furthermore, you explain that the named employee is also a party to the lawsuit. Based on these representations and our review, we agree the information at issue relates to the pending litigation. Therefore, section 552.103 is generally applicable to the remaining information.

However, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, this ruling does not address the applicability of section 552.114 of the Government Code or FERPA to the submitted information. We have marked the information that is confidential under section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must also withhold the information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> The remaining information subject to section 552.022 must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free,

---

<sup>5</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we do not address your remaining claims for this information.

at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/cc

Ref: ID# 350817

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)