



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 11, 2005

Mr. Juan P. Reyna  
Juan P. Reyna, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2067  
Alice, Texas 78333

OR2005-03075

Dear Mr. Reyna:

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# 221723.

The City of Alice (the "city") received a request for a copy of a letter to the city's mayor alleging official oppression and sexual harassment by a named city employee. 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 information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (providing that person may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

You indicate and provide documentation showing that, prior to the city's receipt of this request, the person at issue filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") alleging discrimination and the complaint remained pending on the date the city received this request. Based on the information you have provided, we conclude that you have shown that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the city received this request. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982) (pending EEOC complaint indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated). In addition, based on your representations and our review of the remaining submitted information, we agree that this information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Thus, you have demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103. We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). The submitted document reflects on its face that it was obtained from or provided to the person at issue, who is apparently the only opposing party in the anticipated litigation. Therefore, it may not be withheld under section 552.103.

We note, however, that portions of the submitted information must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> The section excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of common-law right of privacy, which excepts from disclosure information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. 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*

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions 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).

*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.

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 into allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the accused individual responding to the allegations, and the 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 that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "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.*

When there is an adequate summary of a sexual harassment investigation, the summary must be released along with the statement of the accused, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements. In accordance with the common law privacy principles discussed in *Ellen*, the city must redact the information that we have marked, all of which identifies witnesses and victims. The remainder of Exhibit B must be released.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body

will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 221723

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Ida Herrera Garcia  
1201 Ebony Circle  
Alice, Texas 78332  
(w/o enclosures)