



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 17, 2016

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

OR2016-11317

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# 610546 (GC No. 23158).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for records pertaining to disciplinary actions against Solid Waste Department employees over a specified time period. You state you will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the city did not fully comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code. Subsection (b) of section 552.301 requires a governmental body requesting an open records ruling from this office to "ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the tenth business-day after the date of receiving the written request." Gov't Code § 552.301(b). While you raised section 552.103

¹We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

of the Government Code within the ten-business-day time period as required by section 552.301(b), you did not raise section 552.108 of the Government Code until after the ten-business-day deadline had passed. Generally, if a governmental body fails to timely raise an exception, that exception is waived. *See generally id.* § 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions). Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as such, it does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.108. However, we will consider your timely-raised claim under section 552.103.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(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). 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, orig. proceeding); *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 litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue 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.² 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 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). This office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”). *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982).

You state, and provide supporting documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the instant request, two individuals filed EEOC Notices of Charges of Discrimination against the city. You explain the charges at issue are pending. Thus, we find the city has established litigation was reasonably anticipated when the city received the request. Further, you state, and we agree, the information at issue is related to anticipated litigation because it directly relates to the subject matter of the anticipated lawsuits against the city. Accordingly, we find the city may withhold Exhibits 6 and 7 in their entireties and the highlighted portions of Exhibit 2 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation is concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW 575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of

²In 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).

personal privacy[.]”³ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a).

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the former employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). Conversely, to the extent the former employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the city may withhold highlighted portions of Exhibit 2 and Exhibits 6 and 7 in their entireties under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) 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.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Taylor", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/bw

Ref: ID# 610546

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)