



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 16, 2020

Mr. Neal Falgoust  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin  
P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2020-31496

Dear Mr. Falgoust:

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# 858691 (ORR# C079348, C080080).

The City of Austin (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified survey. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The city acknowledges, and we agree, it did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, because sections 552.101 and 552.117 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987). Thus, we will consider whether the submitted information must be withheld on those grounds.

Texas Supreme Court are delineated in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. The identity of an alleged victim of sexual harassment is also excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). However, this office has also found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job).* Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. 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, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989).* Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Such information may not be withheld for individuals who did not make a timely election. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the employees at issue timely elected to withhold that information.

In summary, 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 also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the employees at issue timely elected to withhold that information. 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,

James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/mo

Ref: ID# 858691

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)