



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 27, 2022

Mr. Mike Harper  
School Attorney  
Killeen Independent School District  
P.O. Box 967  
Killeen, Texas 76540-0967

OR2022-33312

Dear Mr. Harper:

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# 977410.

The Killeen Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation.<sup>1</sup> We understand the district redacted student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.1175, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes an officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated numbers assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officer's TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub.*

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

*Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Therefore, we conclude the district must withhold the employees' dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements.

You seek to withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. We note the information at issue does not pertain to a sexual harassment investigation in an employment context for the purposes of *Ellen*. Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

We note, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects 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).

Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides the following:

[F]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual's protected health information:

(1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and

(2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Health & Safety Code § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines "covered entity" to include any person who

(A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

*Id.* § 181.001(b)(2)(A). You assert the district is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. However, in order to determine whether the district is a covered entity, we must address whether the district engages in the practice of "assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information." *Id.* Section 181.001 states "[u]nless otherwise defined in this chapter, each term that is used in this chapter has the meaning assigned by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ["HIPAA"] and Privacy Standards." *Id.* § 181.001(a). Accordingly, as chapter 181 does not define "protected health information," we turn to HIPAA's definition of the term. HIPAA defines "protected health information" as individually identifiable health information that is transmitted or maintained in electronic

media or any other form or medium. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. HIPAA defines “individually identifiable health information” as information that is a subset of health information, including demographic information collected from an individual, and:

(1) Is created or received by a health care provider, health plan, employer, or health care clearinghouse; and

(2) Relates to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition of an individual; the provision of health care to an individual; or the past, present, or future payment for the provision of health care to an individual; and

(i) That identifies the individual; or

(ii) With respect to which there is a reasonable basis to believe the information can be used to identify the individual.

*Id.* Although you assert the district is a covered entity, you have not explained the information at issue consists of protected health information. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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). 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 that “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). 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 district 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. You inform us, and you have provided documentation demonstrating, that the named individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality of this information under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the district’s argument under section 552.1175 of the Government Code against its disclosure.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.<sup>5</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130. Thus, the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) "Informer" means a student or a former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's or persons' possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer's name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student's or former student's name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee's or former employee's name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

*Id.* § 552.135(a)-(c). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of "law," a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. See *id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation, but do not report a violation are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. You assert some of the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported alleged violations of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, however, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue reveals the identity of an informer for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure.

In summary, the officer’s TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The district must withhold the employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure. 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 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,

Cesar Mata  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

CM/jxd

Ref: ID# 977410

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)