



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2022

Mr. Nick Lealos
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Workforce Commission
101 East 15th Street
Austin, Texas 78778-0001

OR2022-05977

Dear Mr. Lealos:

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# 931516 (TWC Tracking No. R009534-090121).

The Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to a specified case.¹ You state you have released some information to the requestor with redactions allowed by law. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 3616 of title 42 of the United States Code authorizes the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") to utilize the services of state and local fair housing agencies to assist in meeting its statutory mandate to enforce laws prohibiting discrimination. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3616. You state, pursuant to this authorization, the commission's Civil Rights Division ("CRD") is currently operating under a cooperative agreement with HUD in the investigation and resolution of complaints of housing discrimination. Section 301.063 of the Property Code states the commission shall receive, investigate, seek to conciliate, and act on complaints alleging violations of the Texas Fair Housing Act. *See* Prop. Code § 301.063. Then, upon the filing of a complaint, both federal and state law mirror each other in language and encourage conciliation to the extent

¹ You state the commission sought and received clarifications of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.2d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

feasible. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3610(b) (providing during the period beginning with the filing of a complaint and ending with the filing of a charge or a dismissal the Secretary of HUD shall, to the extent feasible, engage in conciliation, to the extent feasible); Prop. Code § 301.085 (providing that the commission shall, during the period beginning with the filing of a complaint and ending with the filing of a charge or a dismissal by the commission, to the extent feasible, engage in conciliation with respect to the complaint).

You state the submitted information relates to housing discrimination complaints filed with the commission under its cooperative agreement. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with both federal and state law. 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 section 301.085 of the Property Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

(e) Statements made or actions taken in the conciliation may not be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this chapter without the written consent of the persons concerned.

Prop. Code § 301.085(e). Section 301.085(e) prohibits release of statements made or actions taken during conciliation efforts without written consent from all concerned persons. *See id.* § 301.085(e). You state the information at issue is excepted from disclosure because the CRD’s efforts at conciliation are confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 301.085(e) of the Property Code. We note section 301.085(e) does not protect “conciliation efforts[;]” it protects “statements made or actions taken in the conciliation[.]” *Id.* Upon review, we find the submitted information does not consist of either statements made or actions taken in conciliation. Accordingly, we find the commission may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 301.085(e) of the Property Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(d) Prohibitions and requirements with respect to disclosure of information

(1) Nothing said or done in the course of conciliation under this subchapter may be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this subchapter without the written consent of the persons concerned.

42 U.S.C. § 3610(d)(1). You state the submitted information is excepted from disclosure because the CRD’s efforts at conciliation are confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 3610(d)(1) of title 42 of the United States Code. We note, however, section 3610(d)(1) also does not protect “conciliation efforts[;]” it protects things “said or done in the course of conciliation[.]” *Id.* Upon review, we find the submitted information does not consist of things said or done in the course of a conciliation. Accordingly, we find the commission may not withhold any of the submitted

information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 3610(d)(1) of title 42 of the United States Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in 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 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 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). *See* ORD 551.

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." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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* 518 at 5 (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonable 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). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. 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). Further, the fact that 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).

Although you claim the submitted information is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information relates to litigation to which the commission is a party that was pending or reasonably anticipated at the time the commission received the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Therefore, the commission may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such information will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendations as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You assert the submitted information consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions between and among employees of the commission. However, upon review, we find the submitted information consists of general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the submitted information is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, we note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interest); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990).

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the commission must release the submitted 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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/jm

Ref: ID# 931516

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)