



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 25, 2012

Mr. James R. Evans, Jr
Attorney for Cameron Appraisal District
Hargrove & Evans, LLP
Building 3, Suite 400
4425 Mopac South
Austin, Texas 78735

OR2012-15292

Dear Mr. Evans:

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# 466082.

The Cameron Appraisal District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding a specified property ID and case number, including related e-mails generated in 2012. We understand the district has released some of the requested information and will release certain audio recordings upon the payment of charges. We also understand the district does not have information responsive to portions of the request.¹ We further understand the district will withhold information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or to create responsive information. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App. – San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²Section 552.117 of the Government Code 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. Gov't Code § 552.117(a). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c).

sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we understand the district sought clarification of portions of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request). You do not indicate whether the district received a response to the request for clarification. Thus, for the portions of the requested information for which you have sought but have not received clarification, we find the district is not required to release information in response to those portions of the request. However, if the requestor clarifies those portions of the request for information, the district must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See id.*

Next, we note portions of the request require the district to answer questions. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer general questions, perform legal research, or create new information in response to a request for information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). However, the Act does require the governmental body to make a good faith effort to relate a request to information that the governmental body holds or to which it has access. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8, 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 1-2, 534 at 2-3 (1989). In this instance, we assume the district has made a good faith effort to locate any information responsive to this request. Accordingly, we will address your claimed exceptions for the submitted information.

Next, we note portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are not responsive to the present request for information because they were created after the district received the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the district need not release non-responsive information to the requestor.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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.

³Although you also raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note section 552.022 does not provide an exception to disclosure. Rather, it sets out the categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022. Additionally, although you 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). Further, the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

...

(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 governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. 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 from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To establish that 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.⁴ 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You contend the district reasonably anticipates litigation regarding the submitted information because the requestor served the district with a notice of appeal to the district court of a final order of the Cameron County Appraisal Review Board on July 10, 2012. However, we note the district received the request for information on July 9, 2012. Furthermore, you have not provided any arguments or explanation regarding why the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of the request. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

⁴In 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).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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. 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, 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 e-mails in Exhibit C-2 consist of attorney-client privileged communications made between the district's attorney and district employees for the purpose of the provision of professional legal services to the district. You indicate the communications at issue were not disclosed to non-privileged parties. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the attorney-client privilege for the information at issue. Thus, the district may generally withhold the e-mails in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. If these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district may generally withhold the e-mails in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Kristi L. Wilkins
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLW/ag

Ref: ID# 466082

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)