ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 7, 2012

Mr. John A. Kazen
Kazen, Meurer & Perez, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 6237
Laredo, Texas 78042-6237

OR2012-17890

Dear Mr. Kazen:

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# 471036.

The Laredo Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a specified employee grievance and any subsequent correspondence from the grievance process. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. You also state the district notified two individuals whose privacy may be affected by the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 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). The types of information considered intimate or 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 *Morales v. Ellen,* 840 S.W.2d 519, 525 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of 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 a summary of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Id.* The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the summary of the investigation, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of these documents. *Id.* In concluding, 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.*

In order for the common-law privacy under *Ellen* to apply, the information at issue must pertain to sexual harassment in an employment context. The submitted information pertains to an employment dispute, but it does not involve an investigation of alleged sexual harassment for purposes of *Ellen.* Therefore, the common-law privacy protection afforded in *Ellen* is not applicable here. We also find you have not established any of the submitted information is otherwise highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the submitted information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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 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 from disclosure 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 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, before the district received the request for information, an attorney representing the employee who filed the grievance at issue threatened to bring a lawsuit and provided the district with the draft of an original petition the attorney would serve against the district if the grievance remains unresolved. Based on your representations and our review of your documentation, we conclude you have established the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find you have established the records at issue are related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Thus, section 552.103 is generally applicable to the submitted information. However, the employee who is the opposing party to the anticipated litigation has already seen or had access to the submitted information. 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, there is no interest in now withholding the information under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 but, instead, must release it to the requestor.

---

[1]In addition, this office has concluded 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).

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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tch

Ref: ID# 471036

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)