



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 6, 2016

Ms. Susan G. Morrison
Counsel for the Hutto Independent School District
Chamberlain McHaney
301 Congress Avenue, 21st Floor
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-20046

Dear Ms. Morrison:

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# 625150.

The Hutto Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) all payments made to the district to all entities and/or individuals for services related to the planning and/or construction of Norman Elementary School and (2) all job application materials submitted by a named individual to the district. The district states it has released some information. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the district claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure higher education transcripts of professional public school employees, but does not except the employee's name, the courses taken, and the degree obtained from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.102(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degree obtained, the district must withhold the submitted transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.¹

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district's remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 the district 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. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. Accordingly, the district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.² However, none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and thus, the district may not withhold any of it on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10* (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 (1987) (public employee’s job performance does not generally constitute employee’s private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest and thus, none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code exempts 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.³ *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. 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 only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code exempts 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 at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to public disclosure.

In summary, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degree obtained, the district must withhold the submitted transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470(1987).

the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to public disclosure. The remaining information 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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 625150

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)