ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 17, 2010

Mr. Louis T. Rosenberg
Mr. Nohl Patrick Bryant
Law Office of Louis T. Rosenberg, P.C.
For City of Floresville
322 Martinez Street
San Antonio, Texas 78205-3407

OR2010-03794

Dear Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Bryant:

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# 373389.

The City of Floresville (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for documents related to a re-zoning request for a specified location, the city's zoning ordinance and other city code provisions related to a specified issue, as well as the agendas and minutes from the past three Board of Adjustment meetings. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the request for the city's zoning ordinance and other city code provisions related to a specified issue, or the agendas and minutes from the past three Board of Adjustment meetings. To the extent information responsive to these portions of the request existed on the date the city received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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). The city 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated 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(a).

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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 555 (1990); 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated").

You state the city reasonably anticipates litigation in this instance because the requestor references the city council's appeal process in the request for information. However, you have not provided this office with documentation or other evidence that the requestor has taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit. Upon review, we conclude you have not established that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the request for information. *See* ORD 452 (governmental body must furnish concrete evidence to

establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted 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 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 state the submitted e-mails are communications between the city's attorneys and the city's representatives that were made in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to the city. We understand these communications were intended to be confidential and the confidentiality of these e-mails has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that the city may generally withhold the submitted e-mails under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We note, however, that two of the individual e-mails contained in the submitted e-mail strings you seek to withhold under section 552.107 consist of communications with non-privileged parties. We have marked these non-privileged e-mails. To the extent these non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the submitted e-mail strings, they may not be withheld under section 552.107.

Accordingly, with the exception of the marked non-privileged e-mails that exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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,

Jennifer Burnett
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/dls

Ref: ID# 373389

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)