



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 9, 2007

Mr. Mario R. Gutierrez
Assistant City Attorney
City of New Braunfels
P.O. Box 311747
New Braunfels, Texas 78131-1747

OR2007-00351

Dear Mr. Gutierrez:

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# 268817.

The City of New Braunfels (the "city") received a request for thirteen categories of information pertaining to code compliance complaints against the requestor's client, including the personnel file of the city's planning director. You state that the submitted spread sheet has been released to the requestor, but claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have submitted as a representative sample of the requested information only (1) a copy of municipal court complaint against the requestor's client and (2) the personnel file of the planning director. We generally assume that the "representative sample" of records 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. To the extent any additional responsive information existed when the city received the request for information, we assume that you have released it to the requestor. If not, then you must do so immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, 552.301, 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

We next note that the submitted complaint was filed with the municipal court. A document that has been filed with a court is expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code and may not be withheld unless confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Sections 552.103 and 552.108 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body. *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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived), 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108). Therefore, sections 552.103 and 552.108 do not constitute other law for purposes of section 552.022(a)(17), and the city may not withhold the complaint on those grounds.

You assert that the submitted personnel file is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the requested categories of information are related to pending criminal trials against the requestor's client in the city's municipal court, and that these trials are being prosecuted by the city's municipal court prosecutor. However, we find you have not established how release of the submitted personnel file would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime; therefore, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.108.

You also assert that the submitted personnel file is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which 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 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.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. 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, 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). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated for purposes of section 552.103, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective prosecutor or plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is “realistically contemplated.” See Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is “reasonably likely to result”). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

Based on your representations, we agree that litigation in the form of municipal-court prosecutions against the individual at issue was pending when the city received the request for information; however, you have not established how the submitted personnel file is related to those pending prosecutions. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.103.

You assert that some of the information in the personnel file is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including federal law. Section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code provides that tax return information is confidential. See 26 U.S.C. § 6103(a)(2), (b)(2)(A), (p)(8); see also Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992); Attorney General Op. MW-372 (1981). Accordingly, the W-4 tax form that we have marked is confidential under section 6103(a), and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by 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.” In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information

claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976) for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. Accordingly, we address the city's section 552.102(a) claim in conjunction with its common-law privacy claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Common-law privacy protects information that (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. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 373 (1983). For example, information related to an individual's mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history is generally protected by the common-law right to privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 545, 523 (1989); see also Open Records Decision No. 600 (finding personal financial information to include choice of particular insurance carrier). The submitted documents contain personal financial information, and we do not believe that the public has a legitimate interest in it. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 600 (1992). Thus, we conclude that this information, which we have marked, is confidential under common-law privacy, and the city must withhold it pursuant to section 552.101.

We note that section 552.117 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the submitted information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, 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. 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). The submitted documentation demonstrates that the employee at issue elected not to make his home address and telephone number confidential; therefore, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.117. But the city must withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.117 if the employee timely elected to keep these types of information confidential.

We note that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.130 of the Government Code, which provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). The city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

We note that some of the remaining information is also excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public,” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c), and you do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to its release. Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137.

Finally, we note that the submitted information contains a social security number. Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act. The city must withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147.¹

To conclude, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and common-law privacy, section 552.117 of the Government Code if the employee elected to keep this information confidential, section 552.130 of the Government Code #, section 552.137 of the Government Code, and section 552.147 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining 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).

¹We note that 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 under the Act.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,


James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jww

Ref: ID# 268817

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Paul A. Fletcher
Earl & Associates
111 Soledad Street, Suite 1111
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(w/o enclosures)