



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2022

Mr. Victor I. Cerda
Counsel for the Socorro Independent School District
Escamilla & Poneck, LLP
700 North St. Mary's Street, Suite 850
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2022-34274

Dear Mr. Cerda:

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# 978469.

The Socorro Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for specified communications involving named individuals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. 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 request because it was created after the date of the present request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the district need not release it in response to this request.

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.

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish that 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 that 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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).

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

¹ In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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 inform us the information at issue relates to a district employee's appeal of his proposed termination. You explain appeals filed with the district are "litigation" in that the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. However, in this instance, the employee's notice that he wished to pursue an appeal was received by the district after the date the district received the instant request for information. Further, you have not provided our office with concrete evidence the district anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request or was a party to any litigation which was pending on the date the request was received. *See* ORD 331. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 to the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.103(c) (governmental body must demonstrate that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on or before the date it received request for information), .301(e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Therefore, the district may not withhold the responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, including section 37.108 of the Education Code. Section 37.108 provides, in part:

(b) At least once every three years, each school district or public junior college district shall conduct a safety and security audit of the district's facilities. To the extent possible, a district shall follow safety and security audit procedures developed by the Texas School Safety Center or a comparable public or private entity.

...

(c-1) Except as provided by Subsection (c-2), any document or information collected, developed, or produced during a safety and security audit conducted under Subsection (b) is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Educ. Code § 37.108(b), (c-1). You assert the information at issue is confidential under section 37.108(c-1). *See id.* § 37.108(b). However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue was developed, collected, or produced during a safety and security audit conducted under section 37.108(b). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 37.018(c-1) of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by chapter 418 of the Government Code. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act, sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism. You assert the

responsive information is made confidential by sections 418.181 and 418.182 of the Government Code. Section 418.181 provides,

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

Gov't Code § 418.181. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant part,

(a) [I]nformation . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Id. § 418.182(a). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

Although you claim the information at issue would identify key details and reveal particular vulnerabilities relating to critical infrastructure, you have not provided specific arguments explaining this assertion or identified which portions of the information at issue constitute technical details of any such critical infrastructure, the release of which would reveal the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542, 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Additionally, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the responsive information relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 or section 418.182 to the responsive information, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on either of these bases.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses article 20A.202(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides "[g]rand jury proceedings are secret." Crim. Proc. Code art. 20A.202(a). Article 20A.202, however, does not define "proceedings" for purposes of subsection (a). The Fourth Court of Appeals in *In re Reed* addressed the issue of what constitutes "proceedings" for purposes of the statutory predecessor to article 20A.202(a) and stated the term "proceedings" could "reasonably be understood as encompassing matters that take place before the grand jury, such as witness testimony and deliberations." *See In re Reed*, 227 S.W.3d 273, 276 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2007, orig. proceeding). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the responsive

information reveals grand jury testimony or deliberations of the grand jury. Therefore, we conclude the district may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 20A.202 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

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. However, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision 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), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 392 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). We further note the scope of a public employee's privacy is narrow. *See* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 exception 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 matters 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 that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation 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).

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the responsive information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides,

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from [required public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the responsive information constitutes audit working papers. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.² *See id.* § 552.117(a)(2); *see also id.* § 552.003(1-b) (defining “honorably retired” for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. *See id.* § 552.117(c) (providing “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). It is unclear whether the individual at issue is a current or honorably retired peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) pertains to a currently licensed or honorably retired peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the district must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

To the extent the individual at issue is not a current or honorably retired peace officer, the information at issue may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See id.* §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. As noted above, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. *See id.* § 552.117(c). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. Accordingly, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is not a current or honorably retired peace officer as defined by article 2.12, but timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue is not a current or honorably retired peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

² 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.*

In summary, to the extent the information we have marked pertains to an individual that is a currently licensed or honorably retired peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the district must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual at issue is not a current or honorably retired peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining responsive 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/pt

Ref: ID# 978469

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)