



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 18, 2012

Mr. William M. Buechler
For Flour Bluff Independent School District
Buechler & Associates, P.C.
3660 Stoneridge Road, Suite D-101
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2012-11111

Dear Mr. Buechler:

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# 459178.

The Flour Bluff Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all records of complaints filed by a named student, his family, or his friends. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(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.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). The agency has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show 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 of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated 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 agency must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 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.” See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. See Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state that prior to the date the district received the request, an attorney representing the family of the deceased student threatened litigation against the district for the death of their son. You further state that the family of the deceased student has made specific demands upon the school. Based on your representations and our review, we determine the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Upon review, we agree the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation. We, therefore, conclude the district may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, the potential opposing parties to the anticipated litigation have seen or had access to some of the information. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information

relating to the litigation to obtain such information through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5 (1990). Thus, once an opposing party has seen or had access to information that is related to the litigation, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We note Exhibit C-1 has been seen or accessed by a potential opposing party to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the district may not withhold Exhibit C-1 under section 552.103. However, the information in Exhibit C-2 may be withheld under section 552.103. We note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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, which 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681–82. The types of information considered highly intimate or 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. However, the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, with the exception of Exhibit C-1, which must be released, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and

responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey W. Giles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a period at the end.

Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWG/dls

Ref: ID# 459178

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)