



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 18, 2022

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for City of White Settlement
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2022-05038

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 931374.

The City of White Settlement (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named former employee. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information contains records of the receipt and expenditure of public funds by the city that are subject to section 552.022(a)(3). Such records must be released unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions); 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we marked, may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of sections 552.101 and 552.136 for the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.² Further, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). In this instance, the remaining information consists of personnel records of the named former employee. We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to purely administrative records that do not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). However, you state the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code relates to an active and ongoing criminal prosecution. Based on the city's representation and our review, we conclude release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

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 Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee’s withholding allowance certificate, 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), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 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). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. ORD 545. We note the payroll deductions for federal withholding tax are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101, but the payroll deductions for social security, mandatory retirement, and Medicare are not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 600 at 9-12 (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5; *see also* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 4 (2007) (public employee’s net salary protected by common-law privacy, but gross salary is not).

Upon review, we find some of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, it is not clear whether the marked payroll deductions and benefits reflect mandatory participation by the employee or are the employee’s voluntary financial decisions. Thus, to the extent this information reflects the employee’s voluntary allocation of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, to the extent the information at issue reflects the employee’s mandatory

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the city’s other arguments to withhold this information.

participation in the city's retirement program or benefits paid by the city, the deduction amounts are not confidential and may not be withheld on that basis. Further, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Some of the remaining information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the bank account and credit card numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. 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 withhold the bank account and credit card numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 <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,

Colin Henry
Attorney
Open Records Division

CEH/jxd

Ref: ID# 931374

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)