



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 3, 2011

Mr. Michael W. Dixon
Haley & Olson P.C.
510 North Valley Mills Drive, Suite 600
Waco, Texas 76710

OR2011-14248

Dear Mr. Dixon:

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# 431684.

The City of Bellmead (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for eighteen categories of information regarding e-mails or text messages between specified e-mail addresses or individuals concerning specified topics or containing specified terms and complaints relating to named individuals or specified topics during specified time periods.¹ You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

¹You provide documentation showing the city sought and received clarification from the requestor regarding certain categories of the request. *See Gov't Code § 552.222(b)* (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used).

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

You raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for Exhibit D. Section 552.103 provides, in part, 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.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body claiming this exception bears the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to demonstrate the applicability of the exception. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.”³ *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 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 if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit

³Among other examples, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) 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 (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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).

In this instance, you state the request for information comes from the attorney representing two city employees. You further state that on the same day the city received the request, the requestor also sent the city an offer of settlement. You assert the present request “resembles an exceedingly broad discovery request meant to conduct a fishing expedition.” However, you have not informed us, nor do the submitted documents indicate, the requestor has actually threatened litigation or otherwise taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* ORD 331. Thus, we find you have not established the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code, and it may not withhold Exhibit D under that exception.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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). 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 pet.). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a

communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication 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 Exhibit E consists of communications between an attorney for the city and representatives of the city that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were made in confidence and their confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the e-mails in Exhibit E. However, we note some of the e-mails in Exhibit E were not communications made in furtherance of the rendition of legal services and advice, and, thus, are not privileged. Accordingly, except for the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked for release, the city may withhold Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 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 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. The 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 assert Exhibit F consist of interagency and intra-agency communications involving the discussion of policy issues of the city. However, we find the communications at issue consist of general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Further, you have failed to demonstrate how the city shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the individual to whom the communications were made. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.111 to the information at issue, and the city may not withhold any information in Exhibit F on this basis.

We note a portion of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.117(a)). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117 if the official or employee whose information is at issue made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. If the official or employee whose information is at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117 if the official or employee did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

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). Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners consent to their release.⁵

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

In summary, except for the non-privileged e-mails we have marked for release, the city may withhold Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the official at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/em

Ref: ID# 431684

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)