



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 2, 2016

Ms. Cynthia Trevino
Counsel for the City of Rosenberg
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2016-17365

Dear Ms. Trevino:

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# 620840.

The City of Rosenberg (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident, including e-mails between specified individuals. You state the city will redact some information pursuant to sections 552.130 and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.130 of the Government Code.²

¹We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

²Although the city raises section 552.108 of the Government Code, it makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.³

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted 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 information we have marked consists of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code for the completed investigation, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do 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 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). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107. 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 the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Further, we will consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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

³We assume the “representative samples” 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.

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the information at issue concerns an investigation into allegations of certain conduct by city police officers. You state the final report was sent to the city attorney for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. We understand this report was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege. *See Harlandale*

Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney’s entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, we turn to the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for portions of the remaining information. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those for rule 503. 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege. *See Huie*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state the remaining information in Exhibits B1 and B2 consists of communications involving city attorneys, city representatives, and other city employees and officials. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we note some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if these e-mails are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Next, to the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, we will consider your remaining argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for that information and Exhibit B3. Section 552.103 provides, in relevant part:

- (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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

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). The city 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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 constable's office 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 "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and 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. 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 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. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 452 at 4. We note contested cases conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, are considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991). We further note a contested case before the State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") is considered litigation for the purposes of the APA. *See id.*

You state the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request for information. In this instance, we note, prior to the date the request for information was received, a petition was filed with the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (“TCOLE”) challenging the status of a former employee’s discharge from the city’s police department. You also provide documentation demonstrating this matter was referred to SOAH for a contested case hearing challenging the named former employee’s F-5 Report of Separation, in accordance with section 1701.4525(c) of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code § 1701.4525 (establishing process for officer to contest information in employment termination report). Section 1701.4525(d) states “[a] proceeding to contest information in an employment termination report is a contested case under Chapter 2001, Government Code.” *See id.* § 1701.4525(d). Based on your representations and our review, we determine litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the request for information. Furthermore, we find the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, to the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city may withhold them and Exhibit B3 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁵

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may generally withhold the remaining information in Exhibits B1 and B2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the city maintains the non-privileged e-mails we have marked separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city may withhold them and Exhibit B3 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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/>

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure.

[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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "K" at the beginning.

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 620840

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)