



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 17, 2011

Mr. John C. West
General Counsel
TDCJ - Office of the Inspector General
4616 West Howard Lane, Suite 250
Austin, Texas 78728

OR2011-15095

Dear Mr. West:

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# 433124.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice's Office of the Inspector General (the "department") received a request for investigation files which were the basis of a named individual's disciplinary action or termination and for the named individual's personnel file. You state the department plans to release some of the requested information. However, in doing so you state the department is withholding certain addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, and personal family information pursuant to sections 552.117 and 552.147(b) of the Government Code, as well as the previous determination issued by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2005-01067 (2005).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.122, 552.130, 552.134, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note Open Records Letter No. 2005-01067 serves as a previous determination that the present and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of the department, regardless of whether the current or former employee complies with section 552.1175 of the Government Code, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code. Further, 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).

You claim employee birth dates are confidential 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). The Texas Supreme Court recently 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. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010). Having reviewed the information at issue, we agree the department must withhold employee birth dates in the submitted records under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.²

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, including section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Section 6103(a) renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 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, . . . , 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). Consequently, the department must withhold the submitted W-4 form pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 6103(a). Although you also argue to withhold employee W-2 forms under section 552.101, we note the submitted information does not contain any W-2 forms.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code, which governs the public availability of information submitted to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (“TCLEOSE”) under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.454 provides:

- (a) All information submitted to [TCLEOSE] under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act], unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.

²As we make this determination, we do not address your argument under section 552.101 of the Government Code for this information.

(b) Except as provided by this subchapter, a [TCLEOSE] member or other person may not release information submitted under this subchapter.

Act of May 23, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 545, § 4 (to be codified as an amendment to Occ. Code § 1701.454). The submitted information includes an F-5 Separation of Licensee form that was submitted to TCLEOSE pursuant to subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. In this instance, the submitted F-5 form does not reflect the named former officer to whom this form applies was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses. Therefore, the department must withhold the submitted F-5 form, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code.

You also raise section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 1701.306 makes confidential L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms required by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (“TCLEOSE”). Section 1701.306 provides:

(a) [TCLEOSE] may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a physical examination, blood test, or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCLEOSE]. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a), (b). Upon review, the remaining information does not contain L-2 or L-3 declaration forms. Accordingly, section 1701.306 is not applicable to the remaining information, and no information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which makes medical records confidential. *See* Occ. Code § 159.001. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining submitted information constitutes a medical record for purposes of the MPA. Therefore, none of the remaining information is confidential under the MPA, and no portion of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *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. *See 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 disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* ORD 600 (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). However, information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest

and, therefore, generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under common-law right of privacy); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released along with the statement of the accused under *Ellen*, but the identities of the victim and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the exception of information that would identify the victims and witnesses. We note that supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context. Further, since common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405, 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information pertains to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment and contains an adequate summary of the investigation, as well as a statement by the person accused of sexual harassment. The summary and statement of the accused are not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, information within the summary and the accused's statement that identifies the alleged victim and witnesses must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The department must release the summary and the accused's statement, which we have marked, but the identifying information of the victim and witnesses, which we have also marked, is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld pursuant to

section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See id.* Further, the department must withhold the remainder of the sexual harassment investigation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the court's holding in *Ellen*.

We also find that portions of the remaining information are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, we find none of the remaining information is private, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

³As we make this determination, we need not address your remaining claims for this information.

You state the information you have marked consists of a communication between a department attorney and a department employee. You represent this communication was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services to the department. You indicate this communication was made in confidence and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of an attorney-client privileged communication. Accordingly, the department may withhold the marked information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d at 327 (Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See e.g.* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You seek to withhold the submitted employee assignment rosters and logs under section 552.108(b)(1). You contend this information could be used in the planning and execution of a crime or in facilitating an escape. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated release of the submitted employee assignment rosters and logs would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. We therefore conclude the department may withhold the submitted employee assignment rosters and logs under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure “a test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined the term “test item” in section 552.122 includes “any standard means by which an individual’s or group’s knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated,” but does not encompass evaluations of an employee’s overall job performance or suitability. ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(b) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of “test items” might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976). Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when

the answers might reveal the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987); ORD 626 at 8.

You state the submitted interview questions and answers “relate to the employee’s promotion.” We understand you to argue release of the information at issue could compromise future interviews. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find the submitted interview questions constitute test items under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. We also find the release of the actual answers to these questions would tend to reveal the questions themselves. Therefore, pursuant to section 552.122(b), the department may withhold the submitted interview questions, along with the corresponding actual answers.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.⁴ 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). The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

You claim some of the remaining information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.134 of the Government Code, which relates to inmates of the department and provides:

Except as provided by Subsection (b) or by Section 552.029 [of the Government Code], information obtained or maintained by the [department] is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department.

Gov’t Code § 552.134(a). Section 552.134 is explicitly made subject to section 552.029, which provides, in relevant part:

[n]otwithstanding [s]ection . . . 552.134, the following information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the [department] is subject to required disclosure under Section 552.021:

...

(8) basic information regarding the death of an inmate in custody, an incident involving the use of force, or an alleged crime involving the inmate.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.130 on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Id. § 552.029(8). Upon review of the information you seek to withhold under this exception, we find some of the information pertains to a department employee, not inmates; thus, section 552.134 is inapplicable to this information. We find section 552.134(a) is generally applicable to the remaining information you seek to withhold under this exception. We note, however, some of this information relates to alleged crimes involving inmates. Therefore, the department must release basic information related to these incidents pursuant to section 552.029. Basic information includes the time and place of the incident, names of inmates and department officials directly involved, a brief narrative of the incident, a brief description of any injuries sustained, and information regarding criminal charges or disciplinary actions filed as a result of the incident. With the exception of the records involving a department employee and basic information subject to section 552.029, the department must withhold the information it has marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.134 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 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). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the department must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the address affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, employee dates of birth must be withheld under section 552.102 of the Government Code. The department must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code (1) the submitted W-4 form in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, and (2) the marked F-5 form in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code. The department must release the summary of the sexual harassment investigation and the accused’s statement, but must withhold the identifying information of the alleged victim and witnesses and the remainder of the investigation, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the court’s holding in *Ellen*. We have marked some additional information the department must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, and the employee assignment rosters and logs under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department also must withhold (1) the submitted interview questions and actual answers under section 552.122 of the Government Code, and (2) the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. With the exception of information pertaining to a department employee that we have marked for release and basic information subject to section 552.029 of the Government Code, the department must withhold the information pertaining to inmates that you have marked under section 552.134 of the Government Code. We have marked some additional information regarding inmates that must be withheld under section 552.134 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the

owner of the address affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The remaining information must be released.⁵

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 433124

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including a W-4 form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, a direct deposit authorization form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, and an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.