



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 4, 2016

Ms. Heather Silver  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2016-02788

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 598648.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information showing settlements or awards paid out to police officers who have sued other police officers during a specified time period.<sup>1</sup> You state the city will release some information to the requestor, with redactions made pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>2</sup> You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Government Code.<sup>3</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>4</sup>

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 of the Government Code encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”). *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a “fitness for duty examination” conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is

---

<sup>3</sup>We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, because the exception you claim can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider your claimed exception for the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

<sup>4</sup>We assume that the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

confidential under the ADA and the city must withhold that information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (1992) (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA. 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/>

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your argument against its disclosure.

[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,



Kristi L. Godden  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLG/bw

Ref: ID# 598648

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)