



August 20, 2001

Mr. Roland Castaneda
General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75226-0163

OR2001-3663

Dear Mr. Castaneda:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 150897.

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for all typed and handwritten documents pertaining to an administrative hearing involving a named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.111, and 552.305¹ of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted to this office by the requestor. Gov't Code §552.304.

We first note that one document you submitted as responsive is a memorandum dated June 14, 2001. The Public Information Act applies only to information in existence at the time the governmental body receives the request for information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986) (document is not within the purview of the act if, when a governmental body receives a request for it, it does not exist), 342 at 3 (1982) (Act applies only to information in existence, and does not require the governmental body to prepare new information). The request for information dated June 4, 2001, therefore, does not apply to the submitted June 14, 2001 memorandum.

¹We note that section 552.305 does not provide an exception to disclosure but is procedural in nature.

We will next address your arguments under section 552.103 for the remainder of the submitted information. Section 552.103 of the Government Code, the "litigation exception," 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 governmental body that raises section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of the exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To sustain this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body received the written request for information and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App. – Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be established in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *Id.*

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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *Id.* Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

You state that the requestor is an ex-employee of DART who is seeking administrative review of his recent termination through the DART Management Appeals Committee (MAC). The question is whether this review amounts to "litigation" for purposes of section 552.103. This office has held that "litigation" within section 552.103 includes contested cases conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336, 301 (1982). For instance, this office has held that cases conducted under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, are "litigation" for purposes of section 552.103. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991) (former State Board of Insurance proceeding), 301 (1982) (hearing before Public Utilities Commission). This office has focused on the following factors in determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum: 1) whether the dispute is, for all practical purposes, litigated in an administrative proceeding where a) discovery takes place, b) evidence is heard, c) factual questions are resolved, and d) a record is made; and 2) whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction, *i.e.*, whether judicial review of the proceeding in district court is an appellate review and not the forum for resolving a controversy on the basis of evidence. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

You inform us that the MAC process is "similar to litigation". You state that the parties are represented by counsel, and that witnesses and evidence are presented at a hearing. You have not, however, provided this office with the MAC's rules regarding the grievance procedure, nor have you explained how such a review amounts to "litigation" for purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, we cannot determine whether such a proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum.

In raising section 552.103, you further contend that "one can reasonably anticipate that these proceedings will result in civil litigation . . . [S]hould a negative determination be made at the . . . MAC review, it is reasonable to conclude that [the employee] will pursue civil action" However, you have not provided any concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture. Consequently, we have no basis on which to determine that litigation was reasonably anticipated at the time of the request. Therefore, DART may not withhold the requested documents under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You also raise section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from required public disclosure interagency and intra-agency memoranda and letters, but only to the extent that they contain advice, opinion, or recommendation intended for use in the entity's policymaking process. *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5 (1993). The purpose of this section is "to protect from public disclosure advice and opinions *on policy matters* and to encourage frank and open discussion within the agency in connection with its decision-making processes." *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (emphasis added). However, an agency's

policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters, as disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. See *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000); *Lett v. Klein Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 917 S.W.2d 455 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1996, writ denied) (records relating to problems with specific employee do not relate to making of new policy but merely implement existing policy); Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6 (1993). But see Open Records Decision No. 631 (1995) (finding personnel matters of a broader scope were excepted from disclosure under section 552.111). After reviewing the submitted information, we believe that it relates to internal personnel matters rather than policy matters of DART. Accordingly, DART may not withhold the requested information under section 552.111.

You also contend that the requested information implicates the privacy interests of a third party. Although you raise the right to privacy under section 552.305, we believe the correct exception is section 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrines of common law and constitutional privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and 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. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

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. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). 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)).

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under constitutional or common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, see Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial

information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have reviewed the submitted information and marked a small portion that is private and must be withheld under section 552.101. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

In summary, the marked information must be withheld under common law privacy in conjunction with section 552.101. DART must release the remainder of the responsive information.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/seg

Ref: ID#

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Gregory W. Roberts
114 South Clinton Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75208-5118
(w/o enclosures)