



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 13, 2016

Mr. David T. Ritter  
Counsel for the City of McKinney  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2016-11079

Dear Mr. Ritter:

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# 610324 (City ID# 16-18402).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for personnel files of three named individuals. You state you will redact information pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You state you will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.136, of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which constitutes a representative sample.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>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).

<sup>2</sup> Although you do not raise section 552.130 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on your markings.

<sup>3</sup>We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, in addition to social security numbers redacted pursuant to section 552.147, we note you have redacted portions of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue or has statutory authorization to withhold the information without requesting a decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). We understand you have redacted some information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and motor vehicle record identification information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> We also note you have redacted a date of birth. You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold this information without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000) (previous determinations). Therefore, this information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, because we can discern the nature of this information, we will address its public availability.

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). The Texas Supreme Court 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.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

Section 552.101 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 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

---

<sup>4</sup>Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.

(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 found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 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 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by a 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). This office has also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also recognized that individuals may have a privacy interest in their drug test results. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 594 (1991) (suggesting identification of individual as having tested positive for use of illegal drug may raise privacy issues), 455 at 5 (1987) (citing *Shoemaker v. Handel*, 619 F. Supp. 1089 (D.N.J. 1985), *aff'd*, 795 F.2d. 1136 (3rd Cir. 1986)). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, we note there is a legitimate public interest in information relating to applicants and employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

As noted above, we understand you have redacted information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code. However, we note the remaining responsive information contains additional information subject to section 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of

a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *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 or official 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. You have provided copies of election forms completed by the named employees, in which they elected to keep the information at issue confidential. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue does not consist of information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

As noted above, we understand the city has redacted some information pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, we note the remaining information contains additional information that is subject to section 552.130. Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information does not contain motor vehicle record information. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states "Notwithstanding 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked and you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the city's information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the dates 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 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked and you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Kavid Singh  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KVS/som

Ref: ID# 610324

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)