



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

June 2, 2008

Ms. Laura C. Rodriguez
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2008-07406

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

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# 313537.

The Weslaco Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to specified grievances by district employees, as well as other personnel records pertaining to those employees. You state that you are withholding social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information contains completed evaluations that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Under section 552.022(a)(1), a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body is expressly public unless it either is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly confidential under other law. Although you assert this information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception under the Act and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. 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

¹Section 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.

waived). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the completed evaluations under section 552.103.

You assert that the remaining information 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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body 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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

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 demonstrate that 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.* 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.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation

²In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); 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 threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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).

You inform us that the submitted information is related to two separate grievances filed by a district employee (the "grievant") asserting claims covered by chapter 554 of the Government Code, the Whistleblower Act. Section 554.006 provides, in relevant part, that an aggrieved party must initiate action under the grievance or appeal procedures of the employing state or local governmental entity before filing suit. *See* Gov't Code § 554.006(a). Based on our review of your representations and the information at issue, we find that the district has established through concrete evidence that litigation was reasonably anticipated when it received the present request for information. Furthermore, we find that the information is related to the anticipated litigation. Thus, we agree that section 552.103 is applicable to the remaining information.

We note, however, that the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to the litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). Thus, if the opposing party to pending or anticipated litigation has already seen or had access to information that relates to the litigation, through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in now withholding such information under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982); 320 (1982). The remaining documents you submitted on April 16, 2008, were either provided to the district by the grievant, who is the opposing party to the anticipated litigation, or provided by the district to the grievant; therefore, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.103. However, the district may withhold the information submitted to this office on April 23, 2008 under section 552.103, provided the grievant has not seen or had access to it.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, 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 the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part the following:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). Medical records must be released upon the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *Id.* §§ 159.004, 159.005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). You do not inform us that the release provisions of the MPA are applicable to the requestor. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, 159.005. Thus, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 159.002 of the MPA.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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). The submitted documents contain personal financial information, and the public does not have a legitimate interest in it. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 600. We have marked the information that is confidential under common-law privacy and that the district must withhold under section 552.101.

You assert that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.117 of the Government Code. 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 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).

You have submitted documentation showing the grievant elected to keep these types of information confidential before the district received the request for information; therefore, we agree that the district must withhold the information pertaining to the grievant that you have marked, as well as the information that we have marked, under section 552.117. The district must also withhold the information marked under section 552.117(a)(1) that pertains to other current or former employees if those individuals elected to keep such information confidential before the district received the request for information.

You assert 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 district must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136(b) provides that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” We agree that the district must withhold the bank account numbers that we have marked under section 552.136. However, you have not explained how the “PIN” numbers that you have marked consist of access device numbers used to obtain money, goods, services, or any item of value, or used to initiate the transfer of funds. *See id.* 552.136(a), 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.136 to the PIN numbers, and they may not be withheld on that ground.

We note that some of the remaining information is 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 addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137.

To conclude, the district may withhold the information submitted to this office on April 23, 2008, under section 552.103 of the Government Code if the grievant has not seen or had access to it. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA and common-law privacy and under sections 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code that pertains to the grievant. The district must also withhold the remaining information marked under section 552.117 if it pertains to current or former employees who timely elected to keep that information confidential. The district 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 313537

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ryan Holeywell
The Monitor
1400 East Nolana
McAllen, Texas 78502
(w/o enclosures)