



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 11, 2015

Ms. Monica L. Perez
Counsel for the City of Socorro
Mounce, Green, Myers, Safi, Paxson & Galatzan
P.O. Box 1977
El Paso, Texas 79999-1977

OR2015-18979

Dear Ms. Perez:

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# 578832.

The City of Socorro (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) the time sheets or time records maintained or submitted by or on behalf of the city's Chief of Police over a specified time period and (2) all contracts of employment between the current Chief of Police and the city. 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 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 is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The city 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 city 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 city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, under section 552.103. However, as section 552.101 and section 552.102 of the Government Code 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 city's argument under section 552.103 for the remaining information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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). 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 section 552.103(a) applies 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 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 city states, and provides documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Edmundo Montoya, Plaintiff v. City of Socorro, Defendant*, 3:14-cv-00412-KC, was pending against the city in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, when it received the request for information. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending when the city received the request. We also find the city has established the remaining information is related to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Accordingly, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.¹

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 anticipated 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).

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*

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information at issue.

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 city may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

In summary, the city must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code, which we have marked. The city 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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 578832

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)