



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 24, 2022

Mr. Rick Lambert
Counsel for the North Lamar Independent School District
Powell Law Group
108 Wild Basin Road, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2022-32633

Dear Mr. Lambert:

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# 980686.

The North Lamar Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for three categories of information pertaining to a named former teacher. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The district asserts that some of the submitted information is confidential because it consists of a separation agreement that contains confidentiality provisions. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See Attorney General Opinion JM-672* (1987); *Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3* (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within

¹ Although you do not cite to section 552.101 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise this exception based on your arguments.

an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

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 you 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 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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 you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.102(a) to the submitted information, and the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-prong test described above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. However, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, 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 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee’s private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee’s job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 392 (1982) (reasons for employee’s resignation ordinarily not private). We further note the scope of a public employee’s privacy is narrow. *See* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984). Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body

who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1).² See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "A school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. We note, for purposes of section 552.117, "family member" means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person's home. See *id.* § 552.117(c) (providing "family member" has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). We note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). See Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the named former teacher timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the named former teacher did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1). The district 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

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470.

Mr. Rick Lambert - Page 4

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,

Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/eb

Ref: ID# 980686

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)