



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 6, 2013

Ms. Ellen H. Spalding
Counsel for Eanes Independent School District
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2013-09414

Dear Ms. Spalding:

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# 489621 (EISD request #3468).

The Eanes Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails with information relating to a specified letter and information regarding who it was forwarded to and who was informed of it. You claim the 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.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor and another interested individual. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, you state the responsive information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2013-06340 (2013). In that ruling, we determined, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, you inform us the public grievances that were pending in the prior ruling were no longer pending on the date the district received the instant request for information. Thus, we find the circumstances have changed, and the district may not rely on

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Open Records Letter No. 2013-06340 as a previous determination. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

We note section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the district may not now withhold any previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. Although you raise sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections do not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Thus, to the extent any portion of the submitted information was previously released in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2013-06340, the district may not now withhold such information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111. However, we will address your arguments under these exceptions for the information that was not released in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2013-06340.

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. *See* 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. *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, 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. *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 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 claim the information you have marked is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information you have marked consists of communications between a district attorney and district representatives. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Thus, the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document 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 information you have marked consists of a draft document of a policymaking matter. However, you do not state whether the draft document will be released to the public in final form. Thus, to the extent the draft document will be released to the public in its final form, the district may withhold it in its entirety under section 552.111. If the draft document will not be released to the public in its final form, then the district may not withhold it in its entirety under section 552.111.

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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) 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. *See 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). *See* ORD 551.

This office has long held “litigation,” for purposes of section 552.103, includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

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.” *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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined 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 that 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).

You first assert litigation against the district is currently pending or is reasonably anticipated because prior to the district's receipt of the instant request for information, the requestor filed internal grievances with the district. You state complaints filed with the district are "litigation" in that the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You explain under the district's grievance policy, the grievant proceeds through a three-level process wherein hearing officers hear the complaint at level one and level two, and the district's board of trustees (the "board") hears the grievance if the grievant appeals to level three. You state the grievant is allowed to be represented by counsel, present favorable evidence to the district, and present witnesses to testify on the grievant's behalf. Based on your representations, we find you have demonstrated the district's administrative procedures for grievances are conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, and thus, constitute litigation for purposes of section 552.103. You inform us the board heard the requestor's complaint on March 5, 2013, prior to the district's receipt of the instant request for information. You contend, however, litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated in this matter because the statute of limitations for the requestor to file an appeal to the Commissioner of Education has not yet run. However, because an appeal has not been filed, we find you have not demonstrated the district is a party to pending or anticipated litigation based on the district's grievance hearings.

You also explain the requestor has filed complaints with the State Bar of Texas against three attorneys associated with the district. However, you have not explained how complaints filed with the State Bar of Texas are litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. You also have not explained how the district is a party to any litigation involving the State Bar of Texas complaints. Finally, you have provided an email dated March 7, 2013, in which the requestor accuses the district of libel and slander. You state the district interprets this e-mail to be a threat of litigation. However, upon review of your arguments, you have not provided this office with evidence the requestor had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the district received the instant request for information. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982)*. Thus, based on your representations and our review, we find you have failed to demonstrate litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the district received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code exempts 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).² *See Gov't Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). Upon review, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have

²The 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the draft document you have marked will be released to the public in its final form, the district may withhold it in its entirety under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/dls

Ref: ID# 489621

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)