



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 17, 2012

Ms. Susan Fillion  
Assistant County Attorney  
Harris County  
1019 Congress, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2012-11013

Dear Ms. Fillion:

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# 459031 (12PIA0221).

The Harris County Attorney's Office (the "county attorney's office") received a request for all e-mails sent to or from a named individual from January 1, 2012 to the date of the request. You assert some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, you claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

You contend the information in Group 4 is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." See Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as consisting of

information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body; or

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). You state the information at issue consists of personal messages that have no connection with the county attorney's office's business and constitute incidental uses of e-mail by the county attorney's office employees. You also state these communications were not collected or assembled and are not maintained pursuant to any law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of the county attorney's office's business. We understand the county attorney's office has an e-mail and internet usage policy that recognizes and allows incidental use of electronic mail by employees. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the personal communications you have marked as Group 4 do not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 4 (1995) (Gov't Code § 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). We therefore conclude the information in Group 4 is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request for information.

Next, we note a portion of the information in Group 1 is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (17). The information you have marked as Group 1 contains a check that falls within the purview of section 552.022(a)(3) and court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17). The county attorney's office must release information

subject to section 552.022(a)(3) and section 552.022(a)(17) unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* You raise section 552.103 as an exception to disclosure of the information at issue. However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception that does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived). Accordingly, the information we have marked may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will consider your arguments under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information in Group 1 that is not subject to section 552.022. Additionally, we note some of the information that is subject to section 552.022 in Group 1 includes information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.136 (providing for “confidentiality” of information under section 552.136). As such, we will address the applicability of section 552.136 to the information subject to section 552.022. We will also consider the exceptions you raise for the information that is not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103 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 that 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*

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

*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.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” 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. 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

You state, and the submitted documents at issue reflect, the county is currently a plaintiff in a lawsuit styled *Harris County v. John Joseph Magee*. Additionally, you state, and the submitted documents at issue reflect, several county employees are currently defendants in a lawsuit styled *Debra Jane Huett, B.A. v. Adrian Garcia et al.*, which is pending in the Harris County District Court. Thus, we find litigation involving the county and the county employees at issue, who are represented by the county attorney’s office, was pending when the county attorney’s office received the request. You further assert these documents are related to pending litigation. Accordingly, we find the county attorney’s office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, you generally state the remaining records at issue “relate to ongoing litigation and/or anticipated litigation.” Upon review of the remaining information at issue and submitted arguments, we find the county attorney’s office has failed to identify any specific litigation to which the remaining documents at issue relate. Consequently, we find the county attorney’s office has failed to demonstrate litigation was reasonably anticipated or pending for the remaining information at issue on the date it received the request for information. Thus, the county attorney’s office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Next, we address your claim under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code for the information in Group 2. 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, orig. proceeding). 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, and have provided an affidavit from a county attorney explaining, the information in Group 2 consists of attorney-client communications made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to clients of the county attorney’s office. You also state, as does the submitted affidavit, that these communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations, your supporting affidavit, and our review, we conclude the county attorney’s office may withhold the information in Group 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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. This exception 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. 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. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *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, and provide an affidavit from a county attorney stating, Group 3 consists of e-mails containing advice and opinion on policymaking issues. Upon review, we agree the county attorney’s office may withhold the information we have marked in Group 3 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information in Group 3 consists of general administrative and purely factual information. Thus, you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 552.111 to this information. Therefore, the county attorney’s office may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland*, 22 S.W.3d at 360; ORD 677 at 4-8. Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

(1) [M]aterial 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). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *See id.*; 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 generally assert, and provide an affidavit from a county attorney stating, that portions of the remaining information in Groups 1 and 3 consist of core work product "because they reveal tactics, mental impressions and conclusions used by [the county attorney's office] in developing strategies to defend and/or prosecute lawsuits." Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue was prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial for the purposes of section 552.111. Accordingly, the county attorney's office may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."<sup>4</sup> Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the

---

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

county attorney's office must withhold the bank account and bank routing numbers we have marked in the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the information in Group 4 is not subject to the Act and the county attorney's office need not release it in response to this request for information. The county attorney's office may withhold the information we have marked in Group 1 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The county attorney's office may withhold the information in Group 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county attorney's office may withhold the information we have marked in Group 3 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The county attorney's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 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](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,



Vanessa Burgess  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 459031

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)