



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 1, 2007

Ms. Rebecca Brewer
Abernathy Roeder Boyd Joplin, P.C.
For the City of Frisco
P. O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2007-01260

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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#270413.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents relating to a specified incident. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code provides in pertinent part that "[i]nformation contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in any record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates that identifies or tends to identify an owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of an owner of a vaccinated animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code." Health & Safety Code § 826.0211(a).² The only exception to this confidentiality is that the information may be disclosed "to a governmental entity for

¹Although you raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note that, in this instance, the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 is section 552.107. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

²As amended by Act of June 18, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 1235 § 1, 2005 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. (Vernon).

purposes related to the protection of public health and safety.” *Id.* § 826.0211(b). You seek to withhold a portion of the submitted information under section 826.0211. Based upon your representation and our review, we agree that section 826.0211 is applicable to some of the information at issue. Accordingly, we conclude that the information we have marked is confidential under section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code, and thus must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, because the remaining information is not a rabies vaccination certificate or record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates, it is not confidential under section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code, and the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in relevant part:

(a) Information that is contained in a municipal or county registry of dogs and cats under Section 826.031 that identifies or tends to identify the owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of the owner of the registered dog or cat is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

(b) The information may be disclosed only to a governmental entity for purposes related to the protection of public health and safety. A governmental entity that receives the information must maintain the confidentiality of the information, may not disclose the information under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may not use the information for a purpose that does not directly relate to the protection of public health and safety.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0311(a), (b). The remaining information contains information compiled by the city’s Animal Control Division. Section 826.0311 only applies to the actual pet registry; it is not applicable to the contents of other records, even though those documents may contain the same information as the pet registry. *See Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure).* Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the remaining information is confidential under section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, and the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 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 city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103 exception 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 that the university 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 city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and 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.³ 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. See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

In this instance, you have submitted information indicating that the requestor has threatened to bring suit against the city and state that the information at issue "relates to the reasonable probability of potential litigation" involving the city. However, we determine that you have

³In addition, this office has concluded that 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).

failed to demonstrate that this individual has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. After review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that, for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code, you have not established that the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. *See generally*, Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986) (whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on case-by-case basis). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “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.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). Upon review, we determine that the city may withhold a portion of the remaining information, which we have marked, under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the city has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining information constitutes communications within the attorney client privilege for

section 552.107 purposes. Consequently, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, you must withhold the driver's license information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. Finally, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information must be released.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Holly R. Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRD/krl

Ref: ID# 270413

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Boatman
1632 Crockett
Frisco, Texas 75034
(w/o enclosures)