



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 15, 2007

Mr. Joe Torres, III  
Attorney at Law  
216 North Texas Boulevard, Suite 2  
Alice, Texas 78332

OR2007-13460

Dear Mr. Torres:

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# 291752.

The City of Alice (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file of a former employee. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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 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 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, 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 section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4. Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

The city states that the former employee has hired an attorney who has contacted the city regarding the former employee’s claim of libel and slander. However, the city has not demonstrated that the former employee’s attorney has taken any objective steps towards filing suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331. Thus, we find that the city has not demonstrated that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date that the city received the request. Accordingly, no part of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Prior decisions of this office have held that section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted W-4 form, which we have marked, pursuant to federal law.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” This exception applies when the release of

information would result in a violation of the common-law right to privacy. *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.). The common-law right to privacy is violated if the information (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts about a person's private affairs such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is of no legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976).

Prior decisions of this office have found that personal 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, a public employee's allocation of his salary to a voluntary investment program or to optional insurance coverage which is offered by his employer is a personal investment decision and information about it is excepted from disclosure under the common-law right of privacy. See ORD 545. Likewise, an employee's designation of a retirement beneficiary is excepted from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. See ORD 600. However, information revealing that an employee participates in a group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by the governmental body is not excepted from disclosure. See *id.* at 10. We note that this office has found that the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. See Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 542 at 5 (1990); see also Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We have marked the information that the city must withhold as confidential under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. We find, however, that you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is either intimate or embarrassing or is not of a legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue is confidential and it may not be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

We note that the submitted information contains information that is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the 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. See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). However, information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the current or former employee made the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 after the request for information at issue was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(1989). In this case, the submitted documents reflect that the former employee timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, you must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information “that relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 . See Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a governmental 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 governmental employee. The e-mail addresses we have marked are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses consent to their release.

In summary, the city must withhold the marked W-4 form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.117, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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, 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. 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,



Jessica J. Maloney  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JJM/jh

Ref: ID# 291752

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Chris Maher  
Alice Echo newspapers, Inc.  
405 Main Street  
Alice, Texas 78332  
(w/o enclosures)