



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 2, 2008

Mr. William J. Delmore, III  
Assistant District Attorney  
Harris County District Attorney  
1201 Franklin Street, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77002-1923

OR2008-04403

Dear Mr. Delmore III:

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# 305226.

The Harris County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received requests for specified e-mails and a specified personnel file. You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is not public information under the Act. You also claim that portions of the submitted information are exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.109, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, you inform this office that the first requestor has filed a lawsuit against the district attorney: *KHOU-TV, L.P. and Jeremy Rogalski v. Charles Rosenthal, Jr. District Attorney of Harris County, Texas*, Cause No. 2008-00548, 133<sup>rd</sup> District Court of Harris County,

---

<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.

Texas. As part of this lawsuit, the first requestor seeks a writ of mandamus requiring the district attorney to release all documents responsive to his request. Some of the information responsive to the requests is at issue in the lawsuit. It is the policy of this office not to address issues that are being considered in pending litigation. Accordingly, we will allow the trial court to resolve the issue of whether the documents at issue, which we have marked, must be released to the requestors. We note, however, that some of the submitted information is not at issue in the lawsuit. Therefore, we will address the submitted arguments to withhold this information under the Act.<sup>2</sup>

Next, we note that the submitted information contains information that is not responsive to the requests because it was created after the date of the requests. We have marked the non-responsive information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district attorney is not required to release that information in response to the request.

You claim that some of the remaining e-mails are not subject to the Act. The Act is only applicable to "public information." See Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines public information as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it." Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if it is maintained for a governmental body, the governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information, and the information pertains to the transaction of official business. See Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987).

After reviewing the e-mails at issue, we agree that the e-mails we have marked do not constitute "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business" by or for the district attorney. See Gov't Code § 552.021; see also Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Thus we conclude that the e-mails we have marked are not subject to the Act, and need not be released.

You claim that a portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(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 that the section 552.103 exception 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 that the governmental body 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103.

You state that a portion of the remaining information is related to pending criminal litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find that the information at issue relates to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103. We therefore conclude that the district attorney may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, any submitted information that has either been obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated 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 concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

You also raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for a portion of the remaining information. Section 552.108 provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)-(b). Section 552.108 protects certain specific types of law enforcement information. Section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable if the release of the information would interfere with a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Section 552.108(b)(1) protects internal records of a law enforcement agency, the release of which would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). Sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) are applicable only if the information at issue relates to a concluded case that did not result in a conviction or a deferred adjudication. Section 552.108(a)(3) is applicable to information collected or disseminated under section 411.048 of the Government Code. Sections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) are applicable to information that was prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation or that reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). In this instance, you state that a portion of the remaining information is related to pending criminal investigations and you indicate that this information was prepared by attorneys representing the state. Upon review, we agree that some of the information at issue was either prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation or reflects the mental processes or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state. Therefore, we conclude that the information we have marked may be withheld from disclosure under sections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3). However, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that any aspect of section 552.108 is applicable to the remaining information. We therefore conclude that the district attorney may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code, excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency 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, no writ); *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 that 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. *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).

You state that the remaining information consists of communications that reflect discussion among prosecutors, the district attorney, and the district attorney's general counsel regarding specified policies. Based on this representation and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the district attorney may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find that the remaining information pertains to administrative or personnel matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Accordingly, the district attorney may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

To conclude, we will allow the trial court to determine whether the information subject to *Rogalski*, which we have marked, should be released to the public. The personal e-mails we have marked are not subject to the Act and need not be released. The district attorney may withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestors.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Jordan Johnson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 305226

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joe Larson  
1900 Pennzoil South Tower  
711 Louisiana  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Crowe  
Houston Chronicle  
801 Texas Avenue  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carolyn Canville  
KRIV-TV, Fox 26  
P.O. Box 22810  
Houston, Texas 77227  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christiana Onita  
KHCW News-Channel 39  
7700 Westpark Drive  
Houston, Texas 77063  
(w/o enclosures)