



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 30, 2019

Mr. Brett Norbraten
Open Records Attorney
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711-3247

OR2019-02805

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 748147 (ORR# 20180612-16879).

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for certain information pertaining to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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

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.

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”). 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). 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).

You assert the commission reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the instant request for information. You inform us, prior to receipt of the instant request, the requestor hired an attorney who threatened litigation against the commission for the termination of the requestor. Based on your representations and our review, we find the commission reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a).

We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain

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); and 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).

it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Upon review, we find the opposing party has seen some of the submitted information. Thus, the commission may not withhold this information under section 552.103. Nevertheless, with the exception of the information seen by the opposing party, the commission may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³ We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); *see also* 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.”⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”). *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a “fitness for duty examination” conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) has determined medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). We note the provisions of the ADA preempt any right of access the requestor might have to her own information under state law. *See English v. General Elec.*

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Co., 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *see also La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting that federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation). We note the information we marked pertains to the employee's medical condition and her request for accommodation. Based on our review, we find this information is confidential under the ADA. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.⁵

In summary, with the exception of the information seen by the opposing party, the commission may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA. The commission must release the remaining information, which we marked for release.

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,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/gw

Ref: ID# 748147

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.