



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2013

Mr. Ray Rodriguez
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2013-14887

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

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# 497590 (COSA File No. W016111-060613).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received two requests for all maintenance records and receipts for the escalators located at the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center and all communications between the city, Kone, Inc., and EMR Elevators, Inc. regarding the escalators involved in specified incidents. You claim portions of the submitted information are 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

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant requests for information because it was created after the city received the requests for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the requests and the city is not required to release such information in response to these requests.

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.

Next, we note some of the responsive information may have been the subject of previous requests for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2013-13672 (2013). In that ruling, we determined with the exception of the marked completed reports subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and the video recordings responsive to the first two requests for information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. You now seek to withhold portions of the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides that, 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 city 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Thus, the city may not now withhold any of the previously released information under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the responsive information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-13672 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *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). To the extent the responsive information is not encompassed by the prior ruling, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

Next, we note some of the responsive information 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 unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The responsive information contains completed reports that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed reports pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the completed reports subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d at 475-76; *see also* ORD 676 at 10-11, 470 at 7, 665 at 2 n.5, 663 at 5. Therefore, the completed reports subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1), which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the completed reports subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). Additionally, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining responsive information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if it is 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You assert the completed reports subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) contain privileged attorney-client communications. We note the reports at issue were completed by the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how the completed reports document attorney-client communications for purposes of rule 503. Accordingly, the completed reports subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) may not be withheld on that basis.

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.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. See ORD 638 at 4.

You inform us, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the instant request for information, the city received a notice of claim letter from an attorney concerning the accident at issue. You do not state this letter meets the requirements of the TTCA. However, we note this letter concerns injuries sustained by the attorney’s client and states, “[O]ur client’s injuries are a direct and proximate result of your negligence.” The letter further states, “We would appreciate your cooperation in having a representative of your insurance company contact the undersigned.” Accordingly, based on our review of the notice, the information at issue, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request. Furthermore, we find the information at issue relates to the reasonably anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold the responsive information you have marked that is not subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not consider your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending or anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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 excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the

³The 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).

personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, to the extent the responsive information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-13672 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the responsive information it marked that is not subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, to the extent the individuals at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must also withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their 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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/ac

Ref: ID# 497590

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)