



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 24, 2022

Mr. William S. Helfand  
Counsel for the City of Shenandoah  
Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith, L.L.P.  
24 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1400  
Houston, Texas 77046

OR2022-18277

Dear Mr. Helfand:

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# 953147 (Ref. No. 26746).

The City of Shenandoah (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for nine categories of information pertaining to a named employee and a specified policy. We understand you have redacted a personal e-mail address under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102 and 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present requests because it does not pertain to any of the information requested by the requestors. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the city need not release it in response to these requests.

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

<sup>2</sup> Although you also raise section 552.109 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Next, we note some of the responsive information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-09491 (2016). In 2016-09491, this office ruled that portions of submitted information must be withheld under various confidentiality statutes, including section 552.117 of the Government Code, and the remaining information must be released to the requestor subject to copyright law. We note section 552.117 of the Government Code has been amended since the issuance of Open Records Letter No. 2016-09491. Accordingly, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-09491 and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). Further, section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure, unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3(1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the city may not now withhold any previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. We note section 552.103 does not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Thus, the city may not now withhold information this office previously ordered to be released under section 552.103.

Next, we note you have not submitted any information responsive to two of the categories pertaining to the named employee. Thus, although you state the city has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised this open records letter ruling applies only to the type of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any type of information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of section 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Therefore, we presume the city has released the information responsive to the remaining portions of the requests, to the extent such information existed when the city received these requests for information. If not, then the city must release any such information immediately. *See id.* §§ 552.221, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

We note the responsive information includes an officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officer's TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

We note some of the remaining responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the 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). The remaining responsive information includes completed evaluations subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the information at issue pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.103. However, because section 552.102 makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider its applicability information subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 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 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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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, no pet.); *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 parts of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

You state, and submit supporting documentation demonstrating, the city was involved in litigation that was pending on or before the date of the city's receipt of the present request. Based upon our review of your arguments and the submitted information, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information and

the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the remaining responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the 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 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 been concluded. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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 under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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. You assert the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is protected under section 552.102 of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the information at issue is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-09491 and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with it. The officer’s TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. To the extent it was not previously released, the city may withhold the remaining responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this 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,

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/mo

Ref: ID# 953147

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)