ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 5, 2013

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540

OR2013-13440

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 496197 (Killeen No. W010685).

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for the personnel records of the requestor's client and a list showing the employee name, job title, salary, and exempt status of every position funded with any funds appropriated or authorized by the city council for the current fiscal year. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city only submitted information relating to the requestor's client's personnel file. To the extent information responsive to the rest of the request existed at the time the city received the request for information, we assume the city has released it to the requestor. If not, then the city must do so immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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 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 purpose of section 552.103 is to protect the litigation interests of governmental bodies that are parties to the litigation at issue. *See id.* § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 638 at 2 (1996) (section 552.103 only protects the litigation interests of the governmental body claiming the exception). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing 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 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See 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 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.[1]

---

[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).

See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of the request because the requestor's client filed multiple claims that she was being discriminated and retaliated against at work. You state on April 22, 2012 the city received notice from the Texas Workforce Commission ("TWC") stating that the requestor's client reported to TWC on April 14, 2013, that she is resigning from her job and is seeking unemployment benefits. However, based on our review of your arguments, we find you have failed to demonstrate an unemployment compensation claim hearing constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Furthermore, you have failed to demonstrate the requestor's client had taken any objective steps toward litigation against the city prior to the date the city received the request for information. Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request, and we conclude the city may not withhold 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs access to medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in part:

> (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
>
> (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(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created by a physician or

someone under the supervision of a physician. Therefore, the information we have marked is subject to the MPA and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.[2]

Section 552.101 encompasses section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code, which states "[i]nformation in or derived from a claim file regarding an employee is confidential and may not be disclosed by the [Division of Workers' Compensation of the Texas Department of Insurance (the "division")] except as provided by this subtitle[.]" Labor Code § 402.083(a). In Open Records Decision No. 533 (1989), this office construed the predecessor to section 402.083(a) to apply only to information the governmental body obtained from the Industrial Accident Board, subsequently the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission, and now the division. *See* Open Records Decision No. 533 at 3-6 (1989); *see also* Labor Code § 402.086 (transferring confidentiality conferred by section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code to information other parties obtain from division files). Accordingly, information in the possession of the city that was not obtained from the division may not be withheld on the basis of section 402.083(a). You assert that the information in Exhibit F would implicate documents derived from claim files, and thus, is confidential pursuant to section 402.083. We note some of the information at issue consists of information pertaining to the individual's application for unemployment benefits, not workers' compensation. Accordingly, section 402.083 does not apply to this information, and no portion of this information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. However, we find a portion of the information reflects it was received from the division. Therefore, this information, which we have marked, is confidential under section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code, and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. 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. *See* 540 S.W.2d 668, 683. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open

---

[2]This ruling does not affect an individual's right of access to a patient's medical records from the physician who provided treatment under the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004-.006; *cf. Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, No. 03-11-00481-CV, 2012 WL 5974080 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 21, 2012, no pet.) (MPA does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to request for information under Public Information Act).

Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). This office has also determined that a public employee's net pay is protected by common-law privacy even though it involves a financial transaction between the employee and the governmental body. *See* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 3-5 (2007) (stating that net salary necessarily involves disclosure of information about personal financial decisions and is background financial information about a given individual that is not of legitimate concern to the public). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). In this instance, however, we note the requestor is the authorized representative of the individual to whom the private information pertains. As such, the requestor has a special right of access to private information concerning his client under section 552.023 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual or her authorized representative requests information concerning individual). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the following information under section 552.101 of the Government Code: (1) the medical records we have marked under the MPA; and (2) the information we have marked under section 402.083 of the Labor Code. The remaining information must be released.[3]

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.

---

[3]We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). Because such information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 496197

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)