



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2022

Ms. Lori J. Robinson
Counsel for the San Benito Consolidated Independent School District
Bickerstaff, Heath, Delgado, & Acosta, L.L.P.
3711 South MoPac Expressway, Building One, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2022-23142

Dear Ms. Robinson:

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# 963612.

The San Benito Consolidated Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for twenty-seven categories of information pertaining to a named former employee during a specified time period. You state you released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note Exhibit D consists of minutes of a public meeting. The minutes of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings of open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to governmental body's chief administrative officer or officer's designee), .041 (governmental body shall give written notice of date,

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

hour, place, and subject of each meeting). As a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act, such as sections 552.103 and 552.111, do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Accordingly, the district must release Exhibit D pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, 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.

...

(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 section 552.103(a) 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. *See 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 with "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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter, prior to its receipt of a request for information, containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* 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. 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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361

(1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

This office has long held “litigation,” for purposes of section 552.103, includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

You assert the district anticipated litigation involving the requestor’s client upon receipt of the present request. You state, concurrent with the district’s receipt of the present request, the requestor, on behalf of his client, requested a non-renewal hearing before the board. You also state receipt of the request for a non-renewal hearing initiates the district’s administrative hearing process. You explain, and provide documentation demonstrating, the administrative hearing process provides for the making of a record and results in a decision made by the board, which may be appealed to the Texas Commissioner of Education. We note, at the administrative hearing, an employee may be represented by counsel, present evidence, hear adverse evidence, and cross-examine adverse witnesses. You also explain the employee must complete the administrative hearing process in order to exhaust all administrative remedies prior to filing suit in a court of competent jurisdiction. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the district’s administrative hearing process is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and, thus, constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Further, you state, and we agree, the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the district may withhold Exhibits B and C under section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

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 anticipated or 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 552.101 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

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

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. 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.). 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 the requestor has a right of access to his client's date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code and that information may not be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. *See Gov't Code* § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); ORD 481 at 4 (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district must release Exhibit D pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code. The district may withhold Exhibits B and C under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must release the remaining information.³

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

³ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the district receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

Pearlie Gault
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PG/be

Ref: ID# 963612

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)