



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 9, 2013

Mr. Jeffrey Giles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2013-21356

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 507888 (GC No. 20876).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for arbitration materials pertaining to three named city police department officers and disciplinary information pertaining to one of the named officers.¹ You state the city will release information pertaining to two of the named officers. You claim 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 that the submitted information includes hearing examiners' final decisions from public civil service hearings conducted by hearing examiners on behalf of the city's civil service commission (the "commission"). *See* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.010(c) (providing each commission proceeding shall be held in public), .057(f) (providing the hearing examiner has the same duties and powers as the commission); *see also Downs v. City of Fort Worth*, 692 S.W.2d 209 (Tex.App.—Fort Worth 1985, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (equating appeals to independent third party hearing examiner with appeals to civil service

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request).

commission). Section 143.011 of the Local Government Code provides that “[e]ach rule, opinion, directive, decision, or order issued by the commission must be written and constitutes a public record the commission shall retain on file.” Local Gov’t Code § 143.011(c). Accordingly, we find the hearing examiners’ final decisions are subject to section 143.011 of the Local Government Code and, thus, are public records. As a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act are not applicable to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 544 (1990), 525 at 3 (1989), 378 (1983), 161 (1977), 146 (1976). Further, information that is specifically made public by statute may not be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. *See Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when statute directly conflicts with common-law principle); *Center Point Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County TollRd. Auth.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law). Accordingly, the city must release the submitted final decisions of the hearing examiners, which we have marked for release.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identities of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information in Exhibit 2, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant 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). The governmental body claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Holley v. Blomberg*, civil action number 4:10-cv-2394, was filed against the city in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. You explain the city is a named defendant in the pending lawsuit. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. You also state the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit 3 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982).* Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).*

In summary, the city must release the submitted hearing examiners' final decisions, which we have marked, pursuant to section 143.011 of the Local Government Code. The city must withhold the remaining information we have marked in Exhibit 2 under section 552.101 of

the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit 3 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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.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,



Cynthia G. Tynan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

Ref: ID# 507888

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)