



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 22, 2010

Mr. David Daugherty
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2010-17620

Dear Mr. Daugherty:

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# 400872 (C.A. File No. 10GEN1681).

The Harris County Constable's Office Precinct 2 (the "county") received a request for any communication about the 287(g) program from January 1, 2008, to the date of the request. You state some information is being made available to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹We note that although you raise section 552.1175 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, the proper exception in this instance is section 552.117 of the Government Code, because the county holds the submitted information in an employment context. You also raise section 552.022 of the Government Code. However, we note section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure; rather, section 552.022 lists categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are expressly confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022.

²We 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.

Section 552.103 of the Government 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). A governmental body 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 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(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated for the purposes of section 552.103, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

³In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

You generally assert the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. However, you provide no arguments explaining whether the submitted information relates to any pending litigation or whether the county reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. Accordingly, the county may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, you assert the information you have highlighted is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See 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. *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. *See 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 information you have highlighted consists of communications between county attorneys and their representatives and county employees. You have identified some of the parties to the communications. You state the communications were intended to be

confidential, and you indicate that the communications have maintained their confidentiality. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that the county may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1). We note, however, that you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107.

You assert the highlighted portions of the remaining information are excepted from public disclosure based on the attorney work product privilege. Section 552.111 of the Government Code encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *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 work product as:

- (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 seeking to withhold information under this exception 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. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

- (a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

You state the information at issue consists of communications by and among county attorneys. You state these communications are work product and should be withheld from

disclosure. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by a party or a representative of a party. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the information at issue under the work product privilege of section 552.111.

You also argue the highlighted portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under the deliberative privilege process encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from 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. Section 552.111 also 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).

This office has also concluded that a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus,

section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state the remaining highlighted information contains advice, opinion, and recommendations relating to policymaking matters and includes draft documents. Upon review of your representations and the information at issue, we agree the information we have marked consists of a draft document relating to policymaking. However, you do not inform us whether the county intends to release this document in its final form. Therefore, if the marked draft document will be released in its final form, then the county may withhold the draft document we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. If the marked draft document will not be released in its final form, then this information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.111 and must be released. With respect to the remaining information at issue, we conclude some of the information at issue is factual. We also conclude that you have failed to establish that the remaining highlighted information consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations relating to the policymaking processes of the county. Therefore, the deliberative process privilege section of 552.111 is not applicable to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the county may only withhold the information we have marked under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, you assert some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note that section 552.117 also encompasses personal cellular telephone numbers, provided that the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The county may only withhold the highlighted cellular telephone numbers, and the additional cellular telephone numbers we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individuals in question elected confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. If the individuals made timely elections under section 552.024, and the county does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the county must withhold the highlighted and marked cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1). If the individuals did not make timely elections under section 552.024, the county may not withhold the highlighted and marked cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental

body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act],” unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Likewise, section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. Therefore, the county must withhold the e-mail addresses you have highlighted, and the additional e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses have consented to their disclosure.

In summary, the county may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The county may withhold the draft document we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code if the draft document will be released to the public in its final form. To the extent the individuals at issue made timely elections under section 552.024, and the employees paid for the cellular telephone service with their own funds, the county must withhold the highlighted and marked cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the e-mail addresses you have highlighted, and the additional e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses have consented to their disclosure. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/tp

Ref: ID# 400872

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)