



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 8, 2008

Mr. Jesús Toscano, Jr.
Administrative Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Room, 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2008-09706A

Dear Mr. Toscano:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-09706 (2008) on July 16, 2008. We have examined this ruling and determined that an error was made in its issuance. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306 of the Government Code, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on July 16, 2008. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act ("Act")). Your request was assigned ID# 315826.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received two identical requests from the same requestor for eleven categories of information pertaining to a named paramedic, specifically including incidents involving a named individual. You state that you will release some of the responsive information. You claim that the requested 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 representative sample of information.¹

¹We 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.

Initially, you state that some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-05719 (2008). However, we note that in this instance the requestor has a right of access to some of the information at issue. Therefore, the facts and circumstances have changed with regard to the information at issue, and the city may not rely on the ruling in Open Records Letter No. 2008-05719 in this instance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (setting forth the four criteria for a “previous determination”). However, we will address your current arguments against the disclosure of this 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). A 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 was 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). A 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 establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue 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 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).

In this instance you state that the individual at issue has retained legal counsel and that her counsel is now requesting information from the city. However, we determine that you have failed to demonstrate that the attorney has taken concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* ORDs, 361, 331. Thus, you have not established that the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, 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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides as follows:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member’s agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner’s activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

²Among 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, *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).

(b) The [Polygraph Examiners B]oard or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

(c) A polygraph examiner to whom information acquired from a polygraph examination is disclosed under Subsection (a)(4) may not disclose the information except as provided by this section.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. The submitted information contains information subject to section 1703.306. In this instance, the requestor is the attorney of one of the polygraph examinees. Thus, the city has the discretion to release the polygraph information of the client, which we have marked, pursuant to section 1703.306(a)(1). *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 9 (1987) (predecessor to section 1703.306 permits, but does not require, examination results to be disclosed to examinees). We have marked information of the remaining examinee that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code. However, none of the remaining information at issue consists of information acquired from a polygraph, and none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); 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); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As previously noted, the requestor is an attorney representing the remaining individuals at issue in this instance. Section 552.023 of the Government Code gives a person's authorized representative a special right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect that person's privacy interest as the subject of the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023. Thus, in this instance, the requestor has a special right of access to his clients' information, and the city may not withhold that information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See id.*; ORD 481 at 4. As no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or

embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, 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. 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 employees 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 (1989). In this case, you do not inform us nor provide documentation showing if or when the employee at issue elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, if the employee at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, you must withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit F under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee at issue did not make a timely election.³

Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) states 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." *Id.* § 552.136. You inform us that an employee's identification number is the same number used for credit union bank accounts that belong to the city. Thus, the city must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city has the discretion to release the requestor's client's polygraph information pursuant to section 1703.306(a)(1) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the polygraph information of the remaining examinee under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the employee at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, you must withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit F under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; otherwise,

³Regardless of the applicability of section 552.117, 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.

it must be released. The city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information that we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.⁴

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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.

⁴We note that the information being released contains confidential information to which the requestor has a right of access. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the city receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the city must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'B' inside a circle with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/mcf

Ref: ID# 315826

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Carl Weinkauf
Carl Weinkauf & Associates
4303 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75205
(w/o enclosures)