

July 1, 2019

Mr. Christopher K. Austria
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2019-18124

Dear Mr. Austria:

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# 772977 [PIR No. W083692 and W083863].

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for communications of and information pertaining to two named individuals during a specific time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.136, and 552.139 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 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.

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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

...

(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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing 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 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim 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 *See* 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 that 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). Further, the fact a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state Exhibits G, H, I, and J pertain to pending employee grievances initiated against the city by individual employees under section 554.006 of the Government Code, the Whistleblower Act, for alleged wrongful and retaliatory actions on the part of the city in

²In addition, this office has concluded 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 (“EEOC”), *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).

response to the employee's claims of misconduct by another employee. Further, you provide documentation showing a portion of the information at issue pertains to two specified EEOC complaints filed by two different employees against the city. Section 554.006 of the Government Code provides, in part, that an aggrieved party must initiate action under the grievance or appeal procedures of the employing state or local governmental entity before filing suit. *See* Gov't Code § 554.006(a). You indicate the grievances and EEOC claims were initiated prior to the city's receipt of the requests for the information. You also state the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue is related to litigation the city reasonably anticipated when it received these requests for information. Accordingly, the city may generally withhold Exhibits G, H, I, and J, which we marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note once 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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Therefore, the city may withhold under section 552.103 only those portions of the information at issue that the opposing party to the litigation has not seen or had access to. In this instance, the opposing party has seen or had access to some documents within Exhibit H. This information, which we marked for release, may not be withheld under section 552.103. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold Exhibits G, H, I, and J under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

Upon review, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked in Exhibit C and Exhibit H under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has

not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report;

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use; [and]

...

(4) information directly arising from a governmental body's routine efforts to prevent, detect, investigate, or mitigate a computer security incident, including information contained in or derived from an information security log.

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2), (4). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

(1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a governmental entity;

(2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or

(3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). The city states Exhibit E provides details about the layout and security of information held by the city. The city argues release of the information would provide an insight to what computer network issues exist within the city, where the vulnerabilities are located, and how to expose such vulnerabilities. Based on these arguments and our review of the information, we find that portion of information at issue relates to computer network security, and the design, operation, or defense of the city's computer network. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code.³ However, you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information relates to the city's computer network security, or to the design, operation, or defense of the city's computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). Further, you have not demonstrated the remaining information consists of a computer network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139(b). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). As part of the HSA, sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. Section 418.177 provides that information is confidential if it:

(1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Id. § 418.177. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any

³As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the city to withhold this information.

exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information at issue is confidential under section 418.177 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines “access device” as “a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue consists of access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD No. 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within “zones of privacy,” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the information at issue, we find some of the information, which we marked, falls within the zones of privacy and implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁴ 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 employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; Conversely, to the extent the employees 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, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold Exhibits G, H, I, and J under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked in Exhibits C and H under: (1) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (2) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked in Exhibit E under section 552.139 of the Government Code. To the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we 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.

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

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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

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 "Pearlie Gault", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Pearlie Gault
Attorney
Open Records Division

PG/be

Ref: ID# 772977

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requesters
(w/o enclosures)