



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 26, 2011

Ms. Michelle L. Villarreal  
Assistant City Attorney  
Legal Services  
City of Waco  
P.O. Box 2570  
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2011-13923

Dear Ms. Villarreal:

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# 431532 (LGL# 11-959).

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for time sheets and work schedules for a named employee during a specified time period and personnel and benefit file information pertaining to the Texas Municipal Retirement System. You indicate you have released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 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 section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Prior decisions of this office have held 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 his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, 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 with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, 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 you have not demonstrated how any portion of the submitted information falls within the definition of “return information” under section 6103(b)(2). 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 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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. See *id.* at 681-82. This office has found 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) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). This office has found financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. *Id.* On the other hand, information is excepted from disclosure if it relates to a voluntary investment the employee made in an option benefits plan offered by the agency. *Id.* We further note the scope of a public employee’s privacy is narrow. See Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). You assert 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 has 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 has 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. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.102(a). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.102(a).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, if the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). Conversely, if the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).<sup>2</sup>

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The remaining information must be released.

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

<sup>2</sup>We note 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

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, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping flourish at the end.

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/agn

Ref: ID# 431532

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)