



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2009

Ms. Neera Chatterjee  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2009-12055

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 353713.

The University of Texas System (the "university") received a request for the records of five named individuals, including communications and police reports, occurring over a specified period of time. You state that much of the requested information has been released to the requestor, including through earlier public information requests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.232 (prescribing procedures for response to repetitious or redundant requests for information). You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part:

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with, among other things, the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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.

*Id.* § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* 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. *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. *Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).*

You state that the requestor contacted the university's attorney and alleged that university employees have engaged in discrimination, harassment, and retaliation in violation of the law. You further state the requestor alleged slander, libel, and disparagement by university employees. However, you have not informed us that the requestor has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. Consequently, after reviewing your arguments we find you have not established that the university reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision,” and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with certain provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act. Specifically, you claim a submitted e-mail is subject to sections 418.177 and 418.181 of the Government Code. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. In relevant part, section 418.177 provides:

Information is confidential if the information:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and
- (2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

*Id.* § 418.177. Section 418.181 provides:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

*Id.* § 418.181; *see also id.* § 421.001 (defining critical infrastructure to include “all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, and functions vital to the state or the nation”). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security concerns or emergency management activities does not make the information per se confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information at issue “reflect documents that were created for the purpose of identifying potential critical infrastructure vulnerabilities.” Based on your representation and our review, we agree the information at issue identifies the technical details of a particular vulnerability of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, the university must

withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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 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 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, 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. *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 that the e-mails at issue constitute communications between and amongst university staff and university attorneys that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the university. You have identified the parties to the communications. You assert that these communications were made in confidence and have maintained their confidentiality. 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 under section 552.107. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure of the remaining submitted information, it must be released to this requestor.<sup>4</sup>

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](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,



Matt Entsminger  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRE/dls

Ref: ID# 353713

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>4</sup>We note that the information being released contains the requestor's e-mail address to which the requestor has a right of access. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body to provide him with information concerning himself). Therefore, if the university receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, then the university should again seek a decision from this office.