



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 5, 2015

Mr. Tony Resendez
Counsel for Judson Independent School District
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2015-08677

Dear Mr. Resendez:

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# 562420.

The Judson Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to (1) a specified incident, (2) a specified club for a specified period of time, (3) the termination or non-renewal of "African American employees" for a specified period of time, (4) and information pertaining to retaliation for whistle-blowing activity filed against the district for a specified period of time.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted information pertaining to the termination or non-renewal of "African American employees." To the extent any other information

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

responsive to the request existed on the date the district received the request, we assume the district has released it. If the district has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes a contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by a governmental body that are subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The district must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the district raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d at 475-76 (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, under section 552.103. However, as sections 552.101 and 552.102 make information confidential, we will consider your arguments against disclosure under these exceptions for the information subject to section 552.022. Further, we will address the district's argument under section 552.103 for the remaining information.

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

(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 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* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information 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, 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.); ORD 551 at 4. The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

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 establish 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 found a pending complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982), 281 at 1 (1981).

You provide documentation showing the requestor’s client filed multiple discrimination claims with the EEOC prior to the date of the district’s receipt of this request for information. Additionally, you state the requestor’s client filed two grievance complaints with the district regarding the same issues involved in his EEOC claims. You assert the information at issue is related to the substance of the EEOC complaints. Upon review, we agree the district anticipated litigation related to the information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

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 litigation is not excepted

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 or is no longer anticipated. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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. Upon review, we find none of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. See *id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

In summary, the district must release the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked. The district 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.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 "Paige Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 562420

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)