



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 6, 2012

**Ms. Danielle R. Folsom
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368**

OR2012-19648

Dear Ms. Folsom:

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# 473435 (GC No. 20027).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for (1) specified documents from the personnel file of a named individual; (2) information related to the disciplinary policies of the city's solid waste department (the "department"); and (3) the department's corrective action records for a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part:

- (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 made confidential under this chapter or 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains a completed investigation, which is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city may only withhold the completed investigation if it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law.¹

We have marked the information subject to section 552.022. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). As such, section 552.103 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103. However, portions of the submitted information are subject to sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code, which make information confidential under the Act for purposes of section 552.022.² Therefore, we will consider whether any of the submitted information must be withheld under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130. We will also consider your argument under section 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

You seek to withhold the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 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

¹We note the city does not claim section 552.108 as an exception to disclosure.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate 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 the pending or anticipated litigation. *See 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.). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

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 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.³ *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. *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 assert the information at issue pertains to the administrative appeal filed by the named individual concerning his indefinite suspension with the city's civil service commission. We note that civil service appeals are governed by chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *See Local Gov't Code § 143.057.* This office has determined that such appeal proceedings constitute litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *Cf. Open Records*

³In 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).*

Decision No. 588 (1991) (discussing factors used by attorney general in determining whether administrative proceeding not subject to Administrative Procedure Act may be considered to be litigation). However, the submitted documents reflect that the individual's appeal was not filed until after the date the city received the instant request. Further, you have not established this individual had taken any other concrete steps toward litigation on the date of the request. Therefore, we conclude that litigation concerning this individual was neither pending nor reasonably anticipated when the city received the current request. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note the submitted information contains a CR-3 accident report form subject to section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 made confidential by other statutes, such as section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. This section provides that, except as provided by subsection (c), accident reports are privileged and confidential. Transp. Code § 550.065(b). Section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code, however, requires the release of accident reports to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) date of the accident; (2) name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) specific location of the accident. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4).

In this instance, the requestor has not provided the city with two of the three requisite pieces of information specified by the statute. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted CR-3 accident report form from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82.

The type of information considered highly 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. This office has determined financial information related only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to

generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). The information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and a matter of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Some of the remaining information may be protected from public disclosure by section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of 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). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individual did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information related to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). The city must withhold the driver's license and motor vehicle information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold (1) the submitted CR-3 accident report form from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code; (2) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, if the individual whose information we have marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code; and (4) the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 473435

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)