



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 24, 2017

Mr. John A. Haislet
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of College Station
P.O. Box 9960
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2017-08625

Dear Mr. Haislet:

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# 654240 (Ref. No. 170124.1).

The City of College Station (the "city") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified police report. 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. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[.]" unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 473 (1987)

(section 552.103 may be waived). Although you also seek to withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the court-filed documents we have indicated may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy or under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

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 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 under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

You state an application for writ of habeas corpus, associated with a lawsuit styled *The State of Texas v. John Thuesen*, Cause No. 09-02136-CRF-272, initiated in the 272nd Judicial District Court in Brazos County, Texas, was pending in the Court of Criminal Appeals prior to the city's receipt of this request for information. However, we note the city is not a party to the pending lawsuit and, therefore, does not have a litigation interest in the matter for

purposes of section 552.103. *See* Gov't Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 only applies when governmental body is party to litigation). In such a situation we require an affirmative representation from the governmental body with the litigation interest that it wants the information at issue withheld from disclosure under section 552.103. You state the Brazos County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") affirms it objects to the release of the requested information because of the pending litigation. You state the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is related to the pending lawsuit. Upon review, we agree the information at issue is related to litigation that was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. Therefore, we conclude the city may generally withhold the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.

However, we note information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code, even if it is related to litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information from the submitted information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* ORD 127. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.¹

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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 doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 no portion of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the indicated court-filed documents and basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.

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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 654240

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)