



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 22, 2020

Mr. Thomas Royce Hansen
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2020-18325

Dear Mr. Hansen:

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# 836397 (Request No. W101154-043020).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all documents pertaining to a specified investigation. You state you have released some of the requested information. We understand you will redact e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ 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 information.

Initially, we note the city has redacted portions of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure

¹ Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 21.305 of the Labor Code. You state the submitted information was compiled by the city’s Human Relations Commission (the “HRC”) in the course of its investigation of an employment discrimination claim filed under section 21.201 of the Labor Code. *See* Lab. Code § 21.201 (person claiming to be aggrieved by unlawful employment practice or person’s agent may file complaint with Texas Workforce Commission (“TWC”)). You state the HRC was created under chapter 21 of the Labor Code. *See id.* § 21.152 (providing for creation of local commissions). You also explain, pursuant to chapter 21, both the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the TWC have deferred jurisdiction to hear complaints to the HRC. *See id.* § 21.154 (authorizing deferral of jurisdiction to local commissions); *see also* 40 T.A.C. § 819.76 (authorizing workshare agreements between the TWC and local commissions). Thus, under section 21.152 of the Labor Code, the HRC is a local agency authorized to investigate and resolve complaints of employment discrimination. *See* Lab. Code §§ 21.154 (authorizing local commission to which complaint is referred or jurisdiction is deferred to receive, investigate, conciliate, or rule on complaint), .204 (relating to investigation of complaints by the TWC). Section 21.304 of the Labor Code, which relates to public release of information obtained by the TWC, provides, “[a]n officer or employee of the [TWC] may not disclose to the public information obtained by the [TWC] under Section 21.204 except in compliance with Section 21.305 and as necessary to the conduct of a proceeding under this chapter.” *Id.* § 21.304. The submitted information pertains to a complaint of unlawful employment discrimination. You state the requestor is a party to the complaint filed under section 21.201 of the Labor Code. Section 21.305 of the Labor Code concerns the release of records to a party to a complaint filed under section 21.201 of the Labor Code and provides as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Subsection (c), the [TWC] shall adopt rules allowing a party to a complaint filed under Section 21.201 reasonable access to [TWC] records relating to the complaint.

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c), unless the complaint is resolved through a voluntary settlement or conciliation, on the written request of a party the executive director shall allow the party access to the [TWC] records:

(1) after the final action of the [TWC]; or

(2) if a civil action relating to the complaint is filed in federal court alleging a violation of federal law.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 552.023, Government Code, the following information is not considered public information for the purposes of [the

Act], and may not be disclosed to a party to a complaint filed under Section 21.201:

- (1) identifying information of persons other than the parties and witnesses to the complaint;
- (2) identifying information about confidential witnesses, including any confidential statement given by the witness;
- (3) sensitive medical information about the charging party or a witness to the complaint that is:
 - (A) provided by a person other than the person requesting the information; and
 - (B) not relevant to issues raised in the complaint, including information that identifies injuries, impairments, pregnancies, disabilities, or other medical conditions that are not obviously apparent or visible;
- (4) identifying information about a person other than the charging party that is found in sensitive medical information regardless of whether the information is relevant to the complaint;
- (5) nonsensitive medical information that is relevant to the complaint if the disclosure would result in an invasion of personal privacy, unless the information is generally known or has been previously reported to the public;
- (6) identifying information about other respondents or employers not a party to the complaint;
- (7) information relating to settlement offers or conciliation agreements received from one party that was not conveyed to the other and information contained in a separate alternative dispute resolution file prepared for mediation purposes; and
- (8) identifying information about a person on whose behalf a complaint was filed if the person has requested that the person's identity as a complaining party remain confidential.

(d) In this section, "identifying information" has the meaning assigned by Section 32.51, Penal Code.

Id. § 21.305. You state final agency action has been taken in this case. Further, you do not state the complaint was resolved through a voluntary settlement or conciliation agreement. Pursuant to section 21.305, the requestor generally has a right of access to the HRC's

records relating to the complaint. We note, however, subsection 21.305(c) identifies eight categories of information not considered public information for the purposes of the Act and which may not be disclosed to a party to a complaint filed under section 21.201. *Id.* § 21.305(c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.305(c) of the Labor Code.²

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. 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) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 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). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by this state or another state or country.³ Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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

³ The 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).

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding 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”). Thus, the city must withhold the account numbers you marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.305(c) of the Labor Code. The city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the account numbers you marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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,

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/gw

Ref: ID# 836397

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)