



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 13, 2013

Ms. Cheryl Elliott Thornton
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County Attorney's Office
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2013-09953

Dear Ms. Thornton:

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# 490081 (C.A. File No. 13PIA0145).

The Harris County Appraisal District (the "district") received a request for communications and documents concerning the requestor's suspension from an appraisal review board ("ARB") panel hearing and information pertaining to the suspension of district ARB members from a specified period of time. You state you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's responsibilities under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body receiving an open records request for information that it wishes to withhold pursuant to one of the exceptions to public disclosure is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that

¹Although you do not explicitly raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in your brief, based on your arguments, we understand you to raise this section.

would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Gov't Code § 552.301(e). You state you received the request for information on March 25, 2013. You inform us the district was closed on March 29, 2013. Thus, the district was required to submit the information required by section 552.301(e) by April 16, 2013. However, the district submitted this information in an envelope postmarked April 17, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Thus, we find the district has failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can be overcome by demonstrating the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these exceptions are discretionary in nature. They serve only to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as such, they do not constitute compelling reasons to withhold information for purposes of section 552.302. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the district has waived its claims under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under these exceptions. However, you also raise sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.101 and 552.102 can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of 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. The type of information considered intimate or 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. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwanted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is noted 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 Third Court of Appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court 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. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts*, 354 S.W.3d at 342 (Tex. 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. *See id.* at 346. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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).² Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail

²The 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).*

address has affirmatively consented to its disclosure.³ As you raise no other exceptions against disclosure of the remaining information, it must be released.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 490081

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including 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.