



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2004

Ms. Jo Harrod
Administrative Assistant
Somerville County Sheriff's Department
750 East Gibbs Boulevard
Glen Rose, Texas 76043

OR2004-6671

Dear Ms. Harrod:

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# 206683.

The Somerville County Sheriff's Department (the "sheriff") received a request for all Internal Affairs records concerning a named peace officer whose employment was terminated by the sheriff. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Because your claim under section 552.103 is potentially broadest, we address its applicability first. Section 552.103 provides 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 sheriff 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.*, 958 S.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 sheriff 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open 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).

As evidence that the sheriff anticipates litigation, you have submitted a letter from an attorney, in which the attorney indicates that he represents the named peace officer in the officer’s “grievance/appeal” of his termination by the sheriff. Further, the attorney outlines the officer’s grounds for the appeal. However, you have not established that the relevant grievance process qualifies as litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (this office considers contested case under Texas Administrative Procedure Act to constitute litigation for purposes of litigation exception). Thus, after reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that you have not provided this office with sufficient evidence that the sheriff reasonably anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103 when it received the request for information. We therefore

¹In 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).

conclude that the sheriff may not withhold the information at issue pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code at this time.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains a Report of Separation of License Holder, or F-5, that you state the sheriff provided to the terminated officer as required by state law. The F-5 is made confidential by section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² Section 1701.452 of the Occupations Code requires that a law enforcement agency submit a report to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement regarding an officer licensed under chapter 1701 whose appointment with the law enforcement agency is terminated. *See* Occ. Code § 1701.452. Section 1701.454 provides:

(a) A report or statement submitted to the commission under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552 of the Government Code, unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.

(b) Except as provided by this subsection, a commission member or other person may not release the contents of a report or statement submitted under this subchapter. The report or statement may be released only by the commission employee having the responsibility to maintain the report or statement and only if:

(1) the head of a law enforcement agency or the agency head's designee makes a written request on the agency's letterhead for the report or statement accompanied by the agency head's or designee's signature; and

(2) the person who is the subject of the report or statement authorizes the release by providing a sworn statement on a form supplied by the commission that includes the person's waiver of liability regarding an agency head who is responsible for or who takes action based on the report or statement.

²Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Occ. Code § 1701.454. Therefore, the sheriff must withhold the F-5 form pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code.

Additionally, we address the applicability of section 552.102 to the remaining submitted information. Section 552.102 excepts from required public 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). This exception is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee’s employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person’s employment relationship and is part of employee’s personnel file). The privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test of common-law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.). Common-law privacy under section 552.101 protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The common-law right to privacy encompasses the specific types of information that the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (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). This office has since concluded that other types of information also are private under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has determined to be private).

In this instance, the submitted information at issue concerns the workplace conduct of the named peace officer. As this office has often noted, the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See* Open Records Decision No. 423 (1984). We therefore conclude that you may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.102. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee performed his or her job cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 444 at 4 (1986) (public employee’s personnel file information will generally be available to public regardless of whether it is highly intimate or embarrassing), 470 at 4 (1987) (public employee’s job performance does not generally constitute private affairs), 542 at 5 (1990) (information regarding public employee’s qualifications is of legitimate concern to public).

Finally, we address the applicability of section 552.108 to the remaining submitted information. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Generally, a governmental body claiming section

552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that a portion of one submitted document reveals investigation tactics and informant information, the release of which would jeopardize law enforcement efforts. However, you have not stated that the requested information pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained how its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Thus, you have not met your burden under section 552.108(a)(1) and none of the remaining submitted information can be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the F-5 must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code. All remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cary Grace". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/sdk

Ref: ID# 206683

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Gilbert D. Smith
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 172978
Arlington, Texas 76003-2978
(w/o enclosures)