



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 24, 2015

Mr. Gilbert L. Vasquez  
Counsel for the City of San Juan  
The Vasquez Law Firm  
814 Del Oro Lane  
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2015-05564

Dear Mr. Vasquez:

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# 557222.

The City of San Juan (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests for the same information pertaining to a specified sexual harassment investigation. The city received a third request for the same information related to the specified sexual harassment investigation, in addition to information pertaining to an investigation into missing city monies. You state the city will release some information to the requestors. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(b)*. You state the city received the first request on December 31, 2014. You inform us you were closed for business on January 1, 2015. This office does not count the date the request was received or any dates the governmental body was closed as business days for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was January 15, 2015. We note the city raised sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117,

and 552.137 within the ten-business-day time period as required by section 552.301(b). Further, the city timely-raised section 552.108 for the responsive information related to the missing city monies. However, the city did not raise section 552.108 for the information related to the sexual harassment investigation until January 22, 2015, after the ten-business-day deadline for the first request had passed. Generally, if a governmental body fails to timely raise an exception, that exception is waived. *See generally id.* § 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions). Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Simmons*, 166 S.W.3d at 350 (section 552.108 is not compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, in failing to timely raise section 552.108 of the Government Code against disclosure of the information at issue, the city has waived its claims under section 552.108 with respect to the first request. Further, in waiving section 552.108 for the information at issue in the first request, the city also waived its claim under section 552.108 for this same information with respect to the second and third requests for information. *See Gov't Code* § 552.007 (prohibiting selective disclosure of information); Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). However, we will address the city's timely-raised claims, including the city's claim under section 552.108 for the information pertaining to the missing city monies.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Gov't Code* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information pertaining to the missing city monies relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

Section 552.108, however, does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Gov't Code* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be

released, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Next, we note the remaining information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The remaining information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city may only withhold the information if it is either excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is confidential under the Act or other law. You seek to withhold a portion of this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Further, because sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.136,<sup>1</sup> and 552.137 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will address the applicability of those sections to the remaining information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

We note the remaining information consists of records related to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of common-law privacy to information relating to an investigation of alleged 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. See 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 the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* The *Ellen* court held “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 supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, the remaining information is related to a sexual harassment investigation and does not include an adequate summary. Therefore, the city must generally release the information pertaining to the investigation. However, this information contains the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victim and witnesses. Therefore, the city must withhold the identifying information of the alleged victim and witnesses, which we have marked and indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*.<sup>2</sup> See 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find the city has not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining information identifies a victim or witness of sexual harassment. Further, because the individual whose private information is at issue has been de-identified in the remaining information, the city has not demonstrated the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which makes tax return information confidential. See Attorney General

---

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

Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as follows:

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 Treasury] 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[.]

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 the submitted information contains W-4 forms, which constitute confidential tax return information under section 6103(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked W-4 forms pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. Section 1324a governs I-9 forms and their related documents. This section provides an I-9 form and “any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter” and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the submitted I-9 form in this instance would be “for purposes other than enforcement” of the referenced federal statutes. Accordingly, we conclude the submitted I-9 form and attachment, which we have marked, are confidential pursuant to section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant 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.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded 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 the information we have marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked medical record under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information consists of a physician-patient communication or a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if it is 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You state the information submitted as Exhibit 9 consists of communications between city employees and attorneys for the city. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit 9 under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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). We understand you to 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 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 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 the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, none of the remaining

information is excepted under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not excluded by subsection (c), and you do not indicate the owners have consented to release of their e-mail addresses. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the identifying information of the alleged victim and witnesses, which we have marked and indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. The city must withhold the marked W-4 forms pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the submitted I-9 Form and attachment we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the marked medical record under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city may withhold Exhibit 9 under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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](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,



Lee Seidlits  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 557222

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)