



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 1, 2009

Ms. Elizabeth E. Jones
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of State Health Services
P.O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

OR2009-09089

Dear Ms. Jones:

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# 347632.

The Texas Department of State Health Services (the "department") received a request for communications sent or received by the department between July 20, 2007 and April 13, 2009 with (1) the City of Austin, concerning Push-Up Foundations, Inc. ("Push-Up"), (2) another provider involved in an ATR II program, concerning the cessation of services or termination of the memorandum of agreement # 209-030306-001 (the "memorandum") of Push-Up, (3) Bluebonnet Trails Community MHMR Center, concerning Push-Up, and (4) any other Texas governmental agency, concerning Push-Up, and any interagency communications of the department from July 20, 2007 through April 13, 2009 concerning (1) the cessation of services or termination of the memorandum with Push-Up and (2) the approval or suspension of the memorandum with Push-Up and memoranda concerning these records. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.¹

¹We assume the representative samples of records submitted to this office are 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

Initially, you indicate the information you have crossed out in the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request for information because it does not pertain to Push-Up. Upon review, we agree the information you have crossed out is non-responsive. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information not responsive to the request, and the department is not required to release that information in response to the request.

You seek to withhold a portion of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which 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). The 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 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 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). 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555

extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(1990); *see also* 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 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 state the department received a letter dated April 8, 2009 from Push-Up’s attorney notifying the department Push-Up was asserting a breach of contract claim against the department under chapter 2260 of the Government Code. You explain the department reasonably anticipates litigation because chapter 2260 authorizes a contractor to request a hearing under the contested case provisions of chapter 2001 of the Government Code. We note such contested cases conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, are considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991). You inform us the claim arose from the memorandum with Push-Up for Push-Up to provide transitional housing services for department-funded substance abuse clients and the department’s termination of the contract with Push-Up. You also indicate the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. Furthermore, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. The department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the pending 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 either obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending 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. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Next, you seek to withhold a portion of the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming 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. 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. 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 Texas 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 only to 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 only to 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 writ). 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 department attorneys represent the department’s “programs, regions, hospitals, etc.” Further, you state when a department attorney advises a department program, region, or hospital, the attorney is rendering legal advice to a client. You state the information you have marked consists of confidential communications between department attorneys and the department’s Mental Health/Substance Abuse Division contract management and substance abuse licensing staff that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You also state the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree the information you have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications and the department may withhold this information under section 552.107.

You raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this

test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found certain kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. See *Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. ORD 455 at 4. The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* at 7. The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which identifies an individual who has received services, is intimate and embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing. Further, we find the department has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law or constitutional privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information it has marked under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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.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 at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Emily Sitton
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EBS/rl

Ref: ID# 347632

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)