



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 27, 2014

Mr. Rene Ruiz
Cox Smith Matthews Incorporated
112 East Pecan Street, Suite 1800
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2014-01478

Dear Mr. Ruiz:

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# 512424.

The City of Harlingen (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified complaint filed by a former city employee. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 provides, in 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

¹Although you also raise section 552.1175 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, we note section 552.117 is the correct exception to raise for information the city holds in an employment capacity.

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 governmental body claiming this exception bears the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to demonstrate the applicability of the exception. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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, orig. proceeding); *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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* This office has stated that a pending complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "EEOC") indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982).

You state, and provide documentation that shows, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request, an employee filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC against the city. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request. Further, we find the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation.

However, we note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, if the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then 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 the individual who filed the EEOC complaint has seen the complaint. Because the information at issue has been seen by the opposing party to the anticipated litigation, the city may not withhold it under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82.

Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy.

In this instance, although you claim the submitted information is protected in its entirety by common-law privacy, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which this information must be withheld in its entirety on the basis of common-law privacy. However, upon review, we agree that some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information is protected by common-law privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information falls within the constitutional zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information you have marked is protected by section 552.102(a). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining marked information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, 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. Gov’t Code §§ 552.024, .117(a)(1). 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). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made.

Therefore, to the extent the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The city has failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117, and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under (1) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and (2) section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, to the extent the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "C" and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 512424

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)