



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 16, 2009

Ms. Marivi Gambini
City Attorney's Office
City of Irving
825 West Irving Boulevard
Irving, Texas 75060

OR2009-14695

Dear Ms. Gambini:

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# 358563.

The City of Irving and the Irving Fire Department (collectively, the "city") received a request for all information regarding a specified administrative investigation of a named fire fighter and all medical or psychological examination reports for 2009 pertaining to the named fire fighter. You state the city will provide some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted e-mails, memorandum, and personnel records are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 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 exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. We understand the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a fire fighter: one that must be maintained as part of the fire

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

fighter's civil service file and another the fire department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). The fire fighter's civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the fire fighter's supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in which the department took disciplinary action against the fire fighter under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. In cases in which a fire department investigates a fire fighter's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against a fire fighter, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the fire fighter's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are "from the employing department" when they are held by or are in the possession of the department because of its investigation into a fire fighter's misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a fire department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the personnel records submitted as Exhibit C pertain to an internal administrative investigation regarding the named fire fighter that did not result in disciplinary action, and you indicate these records are maintained in the fire department's internal files as authorized under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on these representations and our review of the submitted documents, we agree the personnel records are confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g). Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

You contend the memorandum submitted as Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which 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 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 Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

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"). 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. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the city reasonably anticipates litigation involving the requestor's client. You state the requestor is an attorney who has represented the named fire fighter during the administrative investigation at issue. You further explain the named fire fighter was recently placed on a performance improvement plan, which could result in disciplinary action being taken against the named fire fighter if he fails to perform at an acceptable level. You have not, however, informed us that the requestor or his client has threatened to sue the city or taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 452, 555. Additionally, a request for information by a potential opposing party or that party's attorney is not by itself enough to establish reasonably anticipated litigation. *See* ORD 361. Therefore, after reviewing your arguments we find you have not established the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information.

Consequently, the city may not withhold Exhibit B under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You assert Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under the deliberative process privilege encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code. *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 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5.

You indicate the draft memorandum submitted as Exhibit B is protected by the deliberative process privilege because it was purposely created in an effort to render a city attorney's legal recommendation regarding the disposition of the administrative investigation at issue. Thus, the memorandum pertains to administrative and personnel matters. As previously stated, the deliberative process privilege excepts communications pertaining to administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect a governmental body's policy mission. *See* ORD 631 at 3. You have not explained how the memorandum pertains to administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the city's policy mission. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate how the deliberative process privilege applies to Exhibit B. Accordingly, Exhibit B may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions for the information within Exhibit B, it must be released to the requestor.

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 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 a capacity other than that of attorney). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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 pet.). 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 assert the e-mails submitted in Exhibit A consist of communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You state the communications were between identified city officials and attorneys and that the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Therefore, the city may withhold the e-mails in Exhibit A, which we have marked, under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As you have not claimed any exceptions to disclosure for the remaining notes and case law in Exhibit A, that information must be released.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city may withhold the e-mails in Exhibit A under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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.

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/dls

Ref: ID# 358563

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)