



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 12, 2010

Mr. Warren M. S. Ernst
Chief of the General Counsel Division
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla, Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2010-17135

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 399791.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the requestor's personnel file and the city's litigation file for a specified case.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³ We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information).

¹You state the city sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used).

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 1-2 (1990).

³We 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, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the request as it does not pertain to the categories of information requested. This decision does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, and that information need not be released in response to the present request.

Next, we note Exhibits F, G, and H and portions of Exhibit B are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part the following:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibits F, G, and H consist of the litigation file for the requested case, which is a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Portions of Exhibit B consist of completed grievance reports and investigations, which are also subject to 552.022(a)(1). You seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111. Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See id.* § 552.007; *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are not other laws that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(1). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider whether the city may withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an

attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file and the governmental body seeks to withhold the entire file, the governmental body may assert that the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the core work product aspect of the privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume that the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (citing *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993)) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes); *see also Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 380 (Tex. 1994) (holding that "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case").

You state the requested information in Exhibits F, G, and H consists of the city's entire litigation file. You explain the file was prepared by a city attorney in preparation for a lawsuit in which the city was a defendant. Based on these representations and our review, we agree the present request encompasses the city's entire litigation file, and the city created the file

for litigation. Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold Exhibits F, G, and H as core work product under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.⁴

Next, we will address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information in Exhibit B not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part:

(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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *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). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

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. *See* Open Records

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument for this information.

Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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). We also note that 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You argue that the city anticipates litigation relating to the city’s failure to promote the requestor and the elimination of the requestor’s position. In support of your argument, you have provided an e-mail from the requestor to the city, which you state indicates the requestor will file both a grievance and a lawsuit against the city. However, upon review, we find you do not provide, and the submitted information does not reveal, any concrete evidence showing that the requestor took any objective steps toward filing suit prior to the city’s receipt of the request. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipates litigation, and the city may not withhold any portion of Exhibit B not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103.

Next, we note Exhibit B contains information that may be subject to sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code, including a medical record pertaining to the requestor.⁵ 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 protected by other statutes. Access to medical records is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), Occ. Code §§ 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(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.

Id. § 159.002(b)-(c). This office has determined that in governing access to a specific subset of information, the MPA prevails over the more general provisions of the Act. *See* Open

⁵The 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).

Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). 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. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See id.* § 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked the requestor's medical record that may only be released in accordance with the MPA.

Section 552.101 also encompasses 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). Information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and is, therefore, generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (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.

The submitted information contains adequate summaries of sexual harassment investigations. The summary is not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information within the summary identifying victims and witnesses is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked in the summaries which identifies the victims and witnesses under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the court's holding in *Ellen* and release the remaining information in the summaries. The remainder of the investigative records we have marked must also be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy because it relates to the sexual harassment investigations. *See id.*

Common-law privacy also protects other types of information. This office has found that medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* ORDs 470 (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.024, .117(a)(1). We note section 552.117(a)(1) encompasses personal cellular telephone and pager numbers and home facsimile numbers, provided the employee pays for the cellular telephone, pager service, or facsimile number with his or her personal funds. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (Gov't Code § 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 that the information be kept confidential. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) to the extent the

marked information pertains to current or former city employees who timely requested confidentiality for the information under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Cellular telephone numbers, pager numbers, and home facsimile numbers may only be withheld, however, if the employee concerned paid for the cellular telephone, pager service, or facsimile number with his or her personal funds.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the Texas driver's license number we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(b). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners have affirmatively consented to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibits F, G, and H as core work product under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The requestor's marked medical record may only be released in accordance with the MPA. The city must withhold the information related to the sexual harassment investigations we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The city must withhold the other information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code to the extent the information pertains to current or former city employees who timely requested confidentiality for the information under section 552.024 of the Government Code, including the cellular telephone, pager, and home facsimile numbers of employees who paid for the numbers at issue with their personal funds. The city must withhold the Texas driver's license number we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must also withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners consent to release.⁶ The remaining information must be released.⁷

⁶This office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold ten categories of information, including Texas driver's license numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code and e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

⁷Because the requestor has a special right of access to the information being released, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarah Casterline', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/eeg

Ref: ID# 399791

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)