



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 24, 2011

Mr. James T. Jeffrey, Jr.
For the City of Pantego
Law Offices of Jim Jeffrey
2214 Park Springs Boulevard
Arlington, Texas 76013

OR2011-12209

Dear Mr. Jeffrey:

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# 427866.

The Town of Pantego (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for any applications for employment submitted by a named individual during a specified time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You indicate you have redacted a social security number pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You claim some of the submitted information is protected under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health

¹We note section 552.147(b) 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).

Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act in Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides that a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with, and is limited to, the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We, therefore, held that the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the town may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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 established. *Id.* at 681–82. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 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). Further, this office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required 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). However, this office has concluded that public disclosure of an individual’s name, home address, and telephone number is not an invasion of privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7

(1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers do not qualify as “intimate aspects of human affairs”). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate concern to the public. The town must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.² However, we find the town has not demonstrated any of the remaining information it has marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the town may not withhold any of the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. You assert some of the remaining information you have marked is protected under constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy,” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). In this instance, you have not demonstrated how constitutional privacy applies to any of the remaining information you have marked. Accordingly, the town may not withhold any of the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

You claim the remaining information you have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) 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). We understand you to argue the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court recently expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163, at *5 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010). The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Id.* at *10. Having carefully reviewed the remaining

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

information, we find none of the remaining information you have marked is excepted under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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 or another state or country[.]"³ Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 4 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)). Upon review, we find the town must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁴

In summary, the town must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The town must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information 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, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, 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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/agn

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold ten categories of information, including a Texas driver's license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Ref: ID# 427866

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)