



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 9, 2004

Ms. Elizabeth P. West  
Senior Personnel Attorney  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
P. O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2004-7705

Dear Ms. West:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208766.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for all documents pertaining to an investigation that resulted from a specified internal employee complaint filed by the requestor. You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under subsection 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that 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.

public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under 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). Thus, the commission must release the completed evaluation under subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under other law.<sup>2</sup> You argue that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103, the "litigation exception," and under section 552.107, which protects attorney-client privileged communications. Sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4-5 (1994) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.107). Thus, the commission may not withhold the evaluation under sections 552.103 or 552.107.

However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the information is confidential under Rule 503. Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

---

<sup>2</sup>We note that the commission does not assert that any of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108.

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. TEX. R. EVID. 503(a)(5). “Client” means an “organization or entity, either public or private, who is rendered professional legal services by a lawyer, or who consults a lawyer with a view to obtaining professional legal services from that lawyer.” *Id.* 503(a)(1).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 4527 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You indicate that the submitted evaluation was communicated by commission employees to commission attorneys in furtherance of the rendition of legal advice to the commission. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted evaluation, we conclude that the commission may withhold the submitted evaluation under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

We now turn to your arguments for the remaining submitted information, which is not subject to section 552.022. 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.

....

(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 sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

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 that 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.” *Id.* Among other instances, this office has concluded that litigation is reasonably anticipated where the prospective opposing party has filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”). *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982). In this instance, you state, and provide documentation showing, that prior to the date the commission received the present request, a complaint was filed against the commission with the Texas Commission on Human Rights (the “TCHR”).<sup>3</sup> The TCHR operates as a federal deferral agency under section 706(c) of title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5. The EEOC defers jurisdiction to the TCHR over complaints alleging employment discrimination. You also state that the remaining submitted information relates to this complaint. Based on your representations and our review of the remaining submitted documents, we find that the commission reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request, and that the remaining submitted information relates to the reasonably anticipated litigation. We therefore conclude that the commission may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>We note that the TCHR has been abolished and that its duties are now performed by the Civil Rights Division of the Texas Workforce Commission. *See* Act of May 28, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 302, § 1, 2003 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 1279.

<sup>4</sup>Because our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your other argument against disclosure.

We note, however, that 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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, we conclude (1) the commission may withhold the submitted evaluation pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence; and (2) the remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code, to the extent it has not been seen by the opposing party in the anticipated litigation.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Sarah I. Swanson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SIS/krl

Ref: ID# 208766

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Audrey Dukes-Fontenot  
1200 Gulf Way  
Round Rock, Texas 78664  
(w/o enclosures)