



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2009

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2009-10957

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 351348.

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for seventeen categories of information related to a specified job posting and a named employee. You state the university does not have information responsive to categories nine and sixteen of the request.¹ You state that you will redact the social security numbers you have marked pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.² You claim portions of the submitted information are not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.137 of the

¹We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ diss'd); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

²Section 552.147(b) authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, you assert that the submitted university Electronic Identification Numbers ("EIDs") are not subject to the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined that certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. You indicate the EIDs are used solely to access the university's computer mainframe and have no other significance other than their use as tools for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public information. Based on your representations and our review, we determine the EIDs in the submitted information do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Accordingly, this information is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

Next, we address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code as it is potentially the most encompassing. Section 552.103 provides, in 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). A 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

³We assume that the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are 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.

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.); see also Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *Id.*

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. 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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). This office has also found that a pending EEOC complaint indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982), 281 at 1 (1981). 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).

You argue that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103 because the university anticipates litigation from the requestor. You state and provide documentation showing that the requestor filed a complaint with the EEOC against the university. We note, however, that the present request was received by the university prior to the requestor's EEOC filing. Further, you do not provide any additional arguments as to how the university anticipated litigation from the requestor prior to the university's receipt of the request. Consequently, you have not established that the university reasonably anticipated litigation with the requestor when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code based on your contention that the university anticipated litigation with the requestor.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy because it constitutes a compilation of an individual's criminal history. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information protected by other statutes. Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is 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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U. S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Upon review, we determine that none of the remaining information constitutes a compilation of an individual's criminal history. Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information as a compilation of criminal history information based on common-law privacy.

The constitutional right to privacy protects two types of interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *Id.* The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.* The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is narrower than that under the common-law right to privacy; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates any party's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the university may not withhold any information under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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). 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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 the e-mails you have marked constitute communications between university staff and university attorneys that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the university. You have identified the parties to the communications. You state that these communications were made in confidence and have maintained their confidentiality. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the marked e-mails, which the university may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Next, you raise section 552.117 for portions of the submitted information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. 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. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who

did not timely request under section 552.024 that the information be kept confidential. Therefore, the university must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) to the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality for that information under section 552.024.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). You have marked e-mail addresses pursuant to section 552.137. We find that the marked e-mail addresses are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Further, you state that you have not received affirmative consent from the owner of the e-mail addresses for their release. Therefore, unless the university receives consent for their release, the university must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked pursuant to section 552.137. *See id.* § 552.137(b).

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *See id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the EIDs you have marked are not subject to disclosure under the Act and need not be released. The university may withhold the e-mails you have marked under section 552.107. To the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality for their information under section 552.024, the university must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137. The remaining information must be released in accordance with copyright law.⁴

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.

⁴We note that because this requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the university must again ask this office for a decision if it receives another request for this information from a different requestor.

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 http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Tamara Wilcox
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TW/dls

Ref: ID# 351348

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)