



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 3, 2022

Mr. Chuong Q. Phung
Assistant City Attorney
City of Grand Prairie
300 West Main Street
Grand Prairie, Texas 75050

OR2022-00135

Dear Mr. Phung:

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# 922679 (Ref. No. 21-0300).

The Grand Prairie Police Department (the "department") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.117 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.

...

¹ We 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.

(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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (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).

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 establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *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. *See* 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 hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (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 submitted information is protected under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department reasonably anticipated litigation or was involved in pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103 when the department received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103.

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 encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code, 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). 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 the department must withhold employee dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the department may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990)*. However, we note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984)*. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.² However, the department failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You assert some of the remaining information is confidential under former section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provided for the confidentiality of certain polygraph information. However, the 87th Legislature repealed former chapter 1703 of the Occupations Code effective September 1, 2021. Act of May 31, 2021, 87th Leg., R.S., HB 1560, § 2.01(1). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with former section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

After reviewing the remaining information, we have determined no novel or complex issue exists in the remaining information. Thus, we address other applicable exceptions in a summary ruling.

The department must withhold the W-4 form pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The department must withhold the submitted I-9 form and attachments pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The department must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The department must withhold the submitted CR-3 accident report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. The department must withhold the personal employee information we marked and indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The department must withhold motor vehicle record information, such as driver's license numbers and states of issuance, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.³ The department must withhold personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The remaining information must be released.

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,

Michelle Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/jxd

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 922679

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)