



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 22, 2017

Dr. Francisco I. Pena
Mayor
City of Rio Bravo
1701 Centeno Lane
Rio Bravo, Texas 78046

OR2017-05830

Dear Dr. Pena:

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# 649718.

The City of Rio Bravo (the "city") received a request for information concerning a named individual. We understand you will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You state the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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 city 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts

¹Section 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* Gov't Code § 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).

²We understand you to raise section 552.101 based on the substance of your arguments.

from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *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 has 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 none of the submitted information is subject to section 552.102(a), and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis.

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects the specific types of information the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation* and is subject to the two-part test described above. *See* 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. 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 none of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the submitted 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](#), 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ian Lancaster".

Ian Lancaster
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

IML/sb

Ref: ID# 649718

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)