



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 17, 2008

Mr. Mario R. Gutierrez
General Counsel and Public Information Officer
Alamo Area Council of Governments
8700 Tesoro Drive, Suite 700
San Antonio, Texas 78217

OR2008-17155

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# 330235.

The Alamo Area Council of Governments (the "council") received a request for the following information: 1) a list of witnesses the council intends to produce at a specified hearing; 2) information regarding the possible termination of the requestor's client, a council employee; 3) the council's employee handbook; 4) any changes made to the handbook since January 19, 2007; 5) the requestor's client's personnel file; and 5) any grievances or complaints made against the requestor's client. You state you have released most of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, we address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code, as it is potentially the most encompassing of your claimed exceptions to disclosure. Section 552.103 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.¹ 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).

You state the requestor was hired by the council employee at issue in the request to represent him at his grievance hearing regarding his possible termination. You assert that the council reasonably anticipates litigation regarding the employee's possible termination. However, you have not submitted evidence that any concrete steps toward litigation have been taken. Therefore, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the council reasonably

¹Among 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).

anticipated litigation on the date the present request was received. Accordingly, the council may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 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 common-law privacy, which protects information that contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performance or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of common-law privacy to information relating to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* The *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of sexual harassment, the summary must be released along with the statement of the person accused of sexual harassment, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must be redacted from the statements. In either event, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We note that supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, a portion of the submitted information refers to an allegation of sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, the information pertaining to the sexual harassment investigation must generally be released. However, a

portion of this information, which we have marked, reveals the identity of the alleged victim. Accordingly, we conclude the council must withhold the victim's identifying information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. However, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is received. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the council may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was received. In this case, you inform us that the employee whose information is at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, the council must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the council must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the ruling in *Ellen*. The council must also withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/eb

Ref: ID# 330235

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)