



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 7, 2016

Ms. Susan G. Morrison
Counsel for the Hutto Independent School District
The Fowler Law Firm, P.C.
919 Congress Avenue, Suite 900
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-15345

Dear Ms. Morrison:

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# 617310.

The Hutto Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent to or from a named individual during a specified time period pertaining to the individual's employment with the district. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have redacted information from the submitted documents. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). We understand the district is withholding e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, you have been granted a previous determination to withhold such information

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). In this instance, you indicate the redacted information consists of “matters [that] are of such a personal and private nature that submitting them to the attorney general would be an invasion of the subject person’s privacy and personal life.” However, we are unable to discern the specific nature of the information that has been redacted. Thus, we find the district has failed to comply with section 552.301 with respect to the redacted information.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. Gov’t Code § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason generally exists when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3, 325 at 2 (1982). You argue the redacted information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because we are unable to review the redacted information, we have no basis for finding that the redacted information is confidential by law. Thus, we conclude the district must release the redacted information to the requestor. If you believe that the redacted information is confidential and may not lawfully be released, you must challenge this ruling in court pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code.

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 governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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, 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 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, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

You argue the district reasonably anticipates litigation because the named individual is represented by counsel. However, upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when the district received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the district has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the submitted information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we find no portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

(a) “Informer” means a student or a former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s or persons’ possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer’s name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student’s or former student’s name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee’s or former employee’s name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

Gov’t Code § 552.135(a)-(c). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of “law,” a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See*

id. § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, witnesses and other individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. You contend release of the information at issue “could substantially reveal the identity of an informer[.]” Upon review, however, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that ground.

In summary, the district must release the redacted information in un-redacted form pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code. The district 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 617310

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)