



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2020

Mr. Daniel D. Jones
City Attorney
City of Fredericksburg
126 West Main Street
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624-3708

OR2020-09997

Dear Mr. Jones:

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# 819393.

The City of Fredericksburg (the "city") received a request for personnel file information of a named city employee. You state the city released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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. This section encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human

¹ 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985)).

This office has previously determined the release of the score report of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (the “MMPI”) implicates an individual’s constitutional right to privacy. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 6 (1992) (relying on *Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589 (1977), and *McKenna v. Fargo*, 451 F. Supp. 1355 (D.N.J. 1978)). We note the MMPI assumes certain components of the personality and scores people as to these traits on a numerical scale to enable comparison with established norms; a report of an individual’s MMPI scores therefore purports to reveal highly intimate information about the individual, including negative characteristics. See ORD 600 at 5 (MMPI scores may reveal, inter alia, the applicant’s tendency toward hysteria, hypochondria, or mood swings). The submitted information includes the results of a personality test, which reveals highly intimate details of the individual’s personality, including negative characteristics. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the personality test results, which we marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member’s agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner’s activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

(c) A polygraph examiner to whom information acquired from a polygraph examination is disclosed under Subsection (a)(4) may not disclose the information except as provided by this section.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. Upon review, we find the information at issue constitutes information that was acquired from a polygraph examination and is, therefore, within the scope of section 1703.306. It does not appear the requestor falls into any of the categories of individuals who are authorized to receive the polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part as follows:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Section 611.001 defines a “professional” as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). The section defines a “patient” as “a person who consults or is interviewed by a professional for diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of any mental or emotional condition or disorder, including alcoholism or drug addiction.” *See id.* § 611.001(1). Upon review, we find the information at issue consists of mental health records that are subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.

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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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. 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).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit C-1, the information you marked, and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The city must withhold Exhibit E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold Exhibit C-1, the information you marked, and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/rm

Ref: ID# 819393

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)