



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 30, 2006

Ms. Chris G. Elizalde  
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.  
P. O. Box 2156  
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2006-03175

Dear Ms. Elizalde:

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# 245411.

The Leander Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of the district's injury investigation regarding a named district employee. You have redacted a social security number that appears in the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b) (governmental body may redact living person's social security number under the Act without the necessity of requesting decision from attorney general's office). Otherwise, you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We begin with your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code as this section's applicability is potentially broadest. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.024 of the Government Code, we note that this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Rather, this section permits a current or former official or employee of a governmental body to choose whether to allow public access to certain information relating to the current or former official or employee that is held by the employing governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024. Section 552.117 of the Government Code is the proper exception under which to withhold such information. Accordingly, we address your arguments for withholding this information under section 552.117.

(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 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 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 that 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.

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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

In this instance, you explain that the submitted information pertains to a district employee who was injured while at work. You argue that litigation is reasonably anticipated because the requestor states that the injured employee "has issued notice that he intends to sue [the requestor's] company in conjunction with his injury[.]" However, you do not state that the district anticipates being a party to this potential litigation. Thus, you have not demonstrated

that the district has a litigation interest in the matter for purposes of section 552.103. See Gov't Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990) (stating that predecessor to section 552.103 only applies when governmental body is party to litigation). Accordingly, we conclude that the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You also claim that some of the submitted information implicates the named district employee's right to privacy. 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. Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.102 excepts from public disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" *Id.* § 552.102(a). Section 552.102 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 common-law privacy standard under section 552.101. 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.) (addressing statutory predecessor). We will therefore consider the applicability of common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claim regarding section 552.102.

In *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy 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 a legitimate concern to the public. See *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).

Upon review, we find that some of the submitted information must be withheld under sections 552.101 and 552.102 on the basis of common-law privacy. We have marked this information accordingly. However, we find that none of the remaining information at issue is protected under common-law privacy. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Lastly, we address your claim under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers,

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. Whether a particular piece of 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). You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that the district employee at issue made a timely election for confidentiality under section 552.024. As such, we agree that the district must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold (1) the information we have marked under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy and (2) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information at issue 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 ten 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Robert B. Rapfogel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RBR/krl

Ref: ID# 245411

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joe Charlton  
Project Manager  
American Constructors, L.P.  
4330 South Mopac Expressway, Suite 230  
Austin, Texas 78735  
(w/o enclosures)