ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 9, 2012

Mr. Clyde A. Pine, Jr.
Counsel for the El Paso ISD
Mounce, Green, Myers, Safi, Paxson & Galatzan, P.C.
For the El Paso Independent School District
P.O. Box 1977
El Paso, Texas 79999-1977

OR2012-12522

Dear Mr. Pine:

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# 461567.

The El Paso Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to any pubic relations, community relations, media and/or image consultant hired during a specified time period.[1] You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.[2] We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client

---

[1]You inform us the district received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

[2]Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege in Texas Rule of Evidence 503, 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). We also note section 552.101 does not encompass of the Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct 1.05. Further, although you assert the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note none of the information for which you claim this privilege is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Thus, section 552.107 is the proper exception to raise for your attorney-client privilege claim in this instance. *See generally* ORD 676.

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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). 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 to only 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 to only a confidential communication, *id.*, 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, 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 inform us that the submitted information consists of e-mail communications between the district's outside counsel, a district official, district employees, and the district's consultants that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also inform us that these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. You identify some of the parties to the communications and we are able to discern the identities of some of the remaining parties. As such, we find the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note the remaining information consists of communications with parties you have not identified and whose identities we are not able to discern as privileged parties. As such, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1).

You raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.103 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, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim 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). Further, the fact a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). In the context of anticipated

---

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

litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is "realistically contemplated." *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result"). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 452 at 4.

You generally assert the remaining information is subject to section 552.103 and state the information is "related to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which [the district], or an officer or employee of [the district] as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party, which litigation is pending and/or reasonably anticipated at the time of [the instant request]." However, you have not informed us, nor do the submitted documents indicate, any party has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); ORD 331. Further, you have failed to provide any arguments demonstrating that actual litigation is realistically contemplated by the district. Thus, we find you have not established that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the district received the request for information. Accordingly, the district has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code to the remaining information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

We note some of the remaining information contains personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.[4] Section 552.137 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). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses have affirmatively consented to their disclosure.[5]

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the remaining information, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners have consented to their release.

---

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

[5]We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) was issued as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including 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.

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,

Kenneth Leland Conyer
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 461567

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)