



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 4, 2013

Ms. Elizabeth M. Provencio  
Counsel for the Housing Authority of City of Laredo  
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal, P.C.  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2013-01980

Dear Ms. Provencio:

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# 477807.

The Laredo Housing Authority (the "authority"), which you represent, received a request for the complete files of tenants referenced in a complaint against the requestor's client and certain policies and procedures. You state the authority has released the requested policies and procedures. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.114, and 552.115 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information fall within the scope of section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code, which provides for the required public disclosure of "information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. See Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). In this instance, the receipts, promissory notes, deposit ledger, and lease agreements we have marked are subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, that exception is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. See *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of information submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the authority may not withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, you also raise sections 552.101 and 552.114 of the Government, which make information confidential under the Act. Thus, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information subject to section 552.022, along with your arguments for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

We first address your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.114 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022. 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which renders tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms), 226 (1979) (W-2 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as:

a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments, . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]

26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service (the “IRS”) regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Chamberlain v. Kurtz*, 589 F.2d 827, 840-41 (5th Cir. 1979); *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). The authority seeks to withhold the submitted information under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The authority states the submitted consists of “a compilation of tax information that was used for the purpose of determining the eligibility for public housing.” However, upon review, we find the authority has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information is subject to section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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

demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered 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. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history).

In Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983), this office determined financial information submitted by applicants for federally-funded housing rehabilitation loans and grants was "information deemed confidential" by a common-law right of privacy. The financial information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 373 included sources of income, salary, mortgage payments, assets, medical and utility bills, social security and veterans benefits, retirement and state assistance benefits, and credit history. Additionally, in Open Records Decision No. 523 (1989), we held the credit reports, financial statements, and financial information included in loan files of individual veterans participating in the Veterans Land Program were excepted from disclosure by the common-law right of privacy. Similarly, we thus conclude financial information relating to an applicant for housing assistance satisfies the first requirement of common-law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities.

The second requirement of the common-law privacy test requires the information not be of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 668. While the public generally has some interest in knowing whether public funds expended for housing assistance are being given to qualified applicants, we believe ordinarily this interest will not be sufficient to justify the invasion of the applicant's privacy that would result from disclosure of information concerning his or her financial status. *See* ORD 373 (although any record maintained by governmental body is arguably of legitimate public interest, if only relation of individual to governmental body is as applicant for housing rehabilitation grant, second requirement of common-law privacy test not met). In particular cases, a requestor may demonstrate the existence of a public interest that will overcome the second requirement of the common-law privacy test. However, whether there is a public interest in this information sufficient to justify its disclosure must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORDs 523, 373.

Open Records Decision Nos. 373 and 523 draw a distinction between the confidential "background financial information furnished to a public body about an individual" and "the basic facts regarding a particular financial transaction between the individual and the public body." Open Records Decision Nos. 523, 385 (1983). Subsequent decisions of this office analyze questions about the confidentiality of background financial information consistently with Open Records Decision No. 373. *See* Open Records Decision

Nos. 600 (personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is protected), 545 (employee's participation in deferred compensation plan private), 523, 481 (1987) (individual financial information concerning applicant for public employment is closed), 480 (1987) (names of students receiving loans and amounts received from Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation are public); *see also* Attorney General Opinions H-1070 (1977), H-15 (1973) (laws requiring financial disclosure by public officials and candidates for office do not invade their privacy rights). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 602 at 5 (1992) (records related to salaries of those employees for whom the city pays a portion are subject to the Act). We note, however, this office has concluded the names and present addresses of current or former residents of a public housing development are not protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 318 (1982). Likewise, the amounts paid by a housing authority on behalf of eligible tenants are not protected from disclosure under privacy interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 268 (1981); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10, 545, 489 (1987), 480. Whether the public has a legitimate interest in an individual's sources of income must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373 at 4; *see also* ORDs 600, 545.

Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the information subject to section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.114(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure student records "at an educational institution funded wholly or partly by state revenue." Gov't Code § 552.114(a). However, the authority is not an educational institution funded wholly or partly by state revenue. Further, you do not inform us, and it does not otherwise appear from our review, the authority received any of the submitted information directly from an educational institution. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.114 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, it must be released.

We next address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part 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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) 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. *See 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). *See* ORD 551.

This office has long held “litigation,” for purposes of section 552.103, includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

You state the submitted information is related to a grievance pending appeal before the authority's Board of Commissioners (the “board”) regarding the requestor's client's termination. You assert employee grievances filed with the authority are “litigation” in that the authority follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You explain under the authority's grievance policy, the grievant proceeds through a three-level process wherein the board hears appeals that proceed to level three. You state the grievant is allowed to have representation, the board reviews evidence, resolves factual questions, and issues a written finding of its determination. Based on your representations, we find you have demonstrated the authority's administrative procedures for employee complaints are conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, and thus, constitute litigation for purposes of section 552.103. We note the requestor filed the notice of appeal of his client's grievance to level three concurrent with the present request for information. Thus, we determine the authority was a party to pending litigation at the time it received the instant request for information. We also find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, the authority may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the authority must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> The authority may withhold the remaining 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](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,



Jennifer Burnett  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/tch

Ref: ID# 477807

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).