



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

November 24, 2008

Mr. Richard L. Bilbie
Assistant City Attorney
City of Harlingen
P.O. Box 2207
Harlingen, Texas 78551

OR2008-16127

Dear Mr. Bilbie:

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# 328825.

The City of Harlingen (the "city") received a request for 1) a named former employee's personnel file; 2) information pertaining to the city's "retire/rehire" program; 3) applications of all persons who applied for a specified employment position; and 4) the name, race, and gender of the person hired for the specified employment position. You state that you have released some of the requested information. You also state that information responsive to category two of the request does not exist.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

¹We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

(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). The city 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. *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). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish 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. ORD 452 at 4. 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. 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). 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. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You contend the city anticipated litigation on the day it received the instant request for information from the former employee's attorney because he represents the former employee in an employment matter involving the city. However, as previously stated, the fact that a

party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information is insufficient to show that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *Id.* You further state that the day after the city received the request, the requestor sent the city a letter that stated "the purpose of this letter is to provide you with notice of this claim[.]" However, because the city received the letter after its receipt of the request for information, you have not demonstrated the requestor or his client had taken concrete steps towards litigation at the time of the city's receipt of the instant request. Thus, we find you have failed to establish the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received this request for information. Accordingly, we conclude none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103.

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 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, while section 552.102(a) 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102(a) privacy claims together.

Common-law privacy protects information that (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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. Upon review, we find that no portion of the submitted information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information for the purposes of common-law privacy. Furthermore, we note the information at issue consists of employment information that is of a legitimate public interest. Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of governmental employees); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee

privacy is narrow). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under either section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy or section 552.102(a).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of an official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of an official or employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 that the information be kept confidential. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that the city employee whose information is at issue made a timely election for confidentiality under section 552.024. We therefore conclude that the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Likewise, section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners have affirmatively consented to their disclosure.

We note portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a)(1), (2). The city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.117 and 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have

marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners have affirmatively consented to their disclosure. The remaining information must be released.²

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

²We note that the information being released contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

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 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Paige Savoie

Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 328825

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)