



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 8, 2013

Ms. Mareia L. Schreiber
Legal Assistant
City of Galveston
P.O. Box 779
Galveston, Texas 77553-0779

OR2013-03951

Dear Ms. Schreiber:

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# 480732 (City ORR # 12-738).

The City of Galveston (the "city") received a request for fourteen categories of information pertaining to the requestor, various allegations involving the requestor, and the requestor being placed on administrative leave, including a specified bargaining agreement and "Red Book." You state the city has released information responsive to categories seven and fourteen of the request. You also state the city does not possess any information pertaining to categories two through five of the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

body[,]” unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or “made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). Some of the submitted information pertains to completed investigations of various workplace allegations. This information is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and must be released unless it is either excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is confidential under the Act or other law. You do not claim section 552.108. Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See 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 Nos. 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Additionally, we note some of the information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code, which protects information made confidential under law.² We will also consider your arguments under section 552.103 for the remaining information 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.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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).*

To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986)*. 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 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)*.

You state the requestor has been indefinitely suspended from the city's fire department. You also state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Additionally, you explain the requestor has filed an appeal to his suspension pursuant to chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. We note municipal civil service appeals, such as the one at issue here, are governed by chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *See Local Gov't Code §§ 143.057, .127-.131*. This office has determined such appeal proceedings constitute litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *Cf. Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991)*. You explain the city anticipated litigation on the matter on the date it received the present request for information because the city had provided notice to the requestor that the city was contemplating disciplinary action against him. However, as of the date the city received the request for information, the city had not yet suspended the requestor and, consequently, the requestor had not appealed his suspension. Accordingly, we find you

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)*.

have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. As such, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 common-law right of 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. However, 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 (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.

We note some of the submitted information pertains to sexual harassment allegations. The information pertaining to allegations made by the requestor does not contain an adequate summary but does include the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victims and

witnesses. The identities of the victims and witnesses other than the requestor, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. We note the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to his own identifying information in the information pertaining to these allegations. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself).

The remaining information pertaining to sexual harassment allegations made by other city employees contains an adequate summary of the investigation, which you have marked as Exhibit C. The summary and the statements of the accused are not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information within the summary and the statements of the accused identifying the victims and witnesses of the sexual harassment is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked that identifies the victims and witnesses, as well as the remaining records of the investigation, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. The city may not withhold any of the remaining information within the summary or the statement of the accused under section 552.101 on this basis.

You assert Exhibit C is privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, which enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *Id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege extends to entire communication, including factual information).

You state Exhibit C constitutes a communication made between a city attorney and a city employee that was made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communication was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit C. *Cf. Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney’s entire investigative report protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold Exhibit C under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The city may withhold Exhibit C under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

⁴Because the information being released in this instance includes information that is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4.

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 that reads "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "L".

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/tch

Ref: ID# 480732

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)