



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 13, 2020

Ms. Lisa Ruiz
Paralegal
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Suite 5DS
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-01252

Dear Ms. Ruiz:

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# 805989 (COD ORR# C009622-101519).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to specified types of injuries occurring at Fair Park during a specified time period.¹ The city states it will release some information to the requestor. The city states it will withhold information pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), and Open Records Letter No. 2017-09757 (2017).² The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.111 of

¹ The city states, and provides documentation showing, it sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. Open Records Letter No. 2017-09757 is a previous determination authorizing the city to withhold the dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the dates of birth of current and former employees held in an employment context under section 552.102 of the Government Code without requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibit D-2 consists of a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The city seeks to withhold Exhibit D-2 under the work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, section 552.111 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions).* Therefore, the city may not withhold Exhibit D-2 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider the city’s assertion of the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Additionally, as section 552.101 of the Government Code applies to confidential information, we will consider the city’s argument under section 552.101 for Exhibit D-2.

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.

³ Although the city also raises section 552.107 of the Government Code, it has not provided any arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302.*

⁴ We assume that 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.

...

(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 claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

The city states, and provides documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Ross v. City of Dallas*, Cause No. DC-19-07222, was filed and is currently pending against the city in the 14th Judicial District Court of Dallas County, Texas. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. The city also states the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on the city's representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold Exhibits B-1, B-2, B-3, C-1, C-2, and D-1 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁵

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation though 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 all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. *See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (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." Gov't Code § 552.101. The city raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for portions of the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health

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

Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9 (2004); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with HIPAA.

Rule 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. Rule 192.5 defines work product as

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. *Id.* 192.5; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8 (2002). In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

- a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and
- b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation

would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORR 677 at 7.

The city claims Exhibit D-2 consists of work product created in anticipation of litigation that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Based on the city’s representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney work product privilege to Exhibit D-2. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit D-2 under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.⁶

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. See *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, in this instance, we find there is a legitimate public interest in portions of the remaining information in the context of the information at issue. Further, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the remaining information contains an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁷ Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁷ The 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).

by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibits B-1, B-2, B-3, C-1, C-2, and D-1 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit D-2 under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Gerald Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/rm

Ref: ID# 805989

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)