



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 7, 2007

Ms. Susan K. Bohn
General Counsel
Lake Travis Independent School District
3322 Ranch Road 620 South
Austin, Texas 78738

OR2007-05348A

Dear Ms. Bohn:

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# 277784.

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district") received a request for several categories of information, including "an example of a Freedom of Information request made by [named persons]," "list of staff members who have been made to research and compile documentation to answer" these requests, and "an example of how [named persons] 'refused to cooperate' with [the district] in clarifying requests." You state that you have released most of the requested information. You claim, however, that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Governmental 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 district has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) 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 the governmental body received the request, 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 district must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

You state and provide documentation showing that, prior to this request, the district was engaged in the litigation styled as *Lake Travis Independent School District v. David Lovelace and Melissa Lovelace*, in the 126th Judicial District. You have not, however, adequately explained how or why any of the submitted information is related to this pending litigation. See Gov't Code § 552.103(a). Since you have not demonstrated that section 552.103 is applicable to the submitted information, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis. See *id.* § 552.301(e)(1) (requiring the governmental body to explain the applicability of the raised exception); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 5 (1990) (attorney general will determine whether governmental body has reasonably established that information at issue is related to litigation), 511 at 2 (1988) (information “relates” to litigation under Gov't Code § 552.103 if its release would impair governmental body's litigation interests).

You claim that Tab 2 is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 Tex. 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 capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel,

such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, 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. Lastly, 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 this definition 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).

You state that Tab 2 consists of communications between district attorneys and employees of the district. You also state that these communications were made in confidence, intended for the sole use of the district, and have not been shared or distributed to others. Based on our review of your representations and the submitted information, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Tab 2. Accordingly, we conclude that the district may withhold Tab 2 pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You claim that Tabs 1 and 3 are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from public disclosure “an 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 section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines attorney work product as consisting of:

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX.R.CIV.P. 192.5. A governmental body that seeks to withhold information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *See id.*; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8.

You claim that Tabs 1 and 3 constitute attorney work product under section 552.111 because their release would reveal the mental impressions and legal strategies of the district's attorneys. Upon review, however, we find that the records at issue in Tabs 1 and 3 were not made in anticipation of litigation by or for the district, but most, in fact, were created by the opposing party. Accordingly, we find section 552.111 does not apply and the district may not withhold any of Tab 1 and 3 on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

You claim that the marked e-mail address in Tab 3 is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See Gov't Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that Tab 1 also contains an e-mail address for the same individual as the district has marked in Tab 3. The e-mail addresses at issue are not the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). The district states that the individual whose e-mail addresses are at issue has not consented to the release of his e-mail addresses. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address you have marked in Tab 3, as well as the e-mail address we have marked in Tab 1, under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold Tab 2 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail address you have marked in Tab 3, as well as the e-mail address we have marked in Tab 1, under section 552.137 of the Government Code. As you do not raise any other exceptions against 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,



Jaclyn N. Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JNT/ma

Ref: ID# 277784

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jay Plotkin
Lake Travis View
107 Ranch Road 620, South
PMB 5F
Austin, Texas 78734
(w/o enclosures)