



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 6, 2004

Mr. Les Moore
Police Legal Adviser
City of Irving
305 North O'Connor Road
Irving, Texas 75061

OR2004-0068

Dear Mr. Moore:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 193785.

The Irving Police Department (the "department") received two requests for reports and other information related to an incident that occurred on April 30, 2003 involving a named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes reports which are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides that "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," is public and may not be withheld unless it is expressly confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure by section 552.108. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). You do not claim that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108. You assert that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103. This section is a discretionary exception and is not "other law" for the purpose of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v.*

¹We assume that the 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Dallas Morning News, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App–Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Therefore the reports, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103. We note, however, that certain information within the documents subject to section 552.022 is confidential and must be withheld. We will address the information subject to section 552.022 next.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision,” and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683. After reviewing the information subject to section 552.022, we find that it contains such highly intimate or embarrassing facts that are of no legitimate concern to the public, and thus conclude this information, which we have marked, is protected by common-law privacy and therefore must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

We also note that the information subject to section 552.022 contains social security numbers which may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that any of the social security numbers in the submitted records are confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and, therefore, excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 and the referenced federal provision. However, we caution the department that section 552.352 of the Public Information Act (the “Act”) imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information from the documents subject to section 552.022, you should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the department pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Finally, section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See Gov’t Code*

§ 552.130. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We now turn to your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The department has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The department must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see Open

²In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, see Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, see Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, see Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Based on the information you have provided, we conclude that you have shown that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the department received these requests. In addition, our review of the records at issue shows that they are related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Thus, you have demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. In this instance, the submitted documents include a letter from opposing counsel; this document may not be withheld under section 552.103. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, we conclude that the department must release the documents that are subject to section 552.022. However, the department must withhold from these documents (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, and (2) the information we have marked under section 552.130. Further, social security numbers within these documents may be confidential under federal law. Finally, to the extent it has not been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation, the remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 193785

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kevin Krause
The Dallas Morning News
P. O. Box 655237
Dallas, Texas 75265
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Erik W. Hansen
Marsh & Odom, L.L.P.
101 South Woodrow, Suite B
Denton, Texas 76205
(w/o enclosures)