



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 3, 2013

Mr. Joseph K. Deeb  
Counsel for the City of Thorndale  
Bojorquez Law Firm, P.L.L.C.  
12325 Hymeadow Drive, Suite 2-100  
Austin, Texas 78750

OR2013-17280

Dear Mr. Deeb:

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# 501264.

The City of Thorndale (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named former chief of the city's police department, including the former chief's two most recent performance evaluations performed by the chief's supervisor, the city council, or a third party, and records or reports of reprimands issued to the former chief during a specified time period. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.106, 552.108, 552.109, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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). The purpose of section 552.103 is to protect the litigation interests of governmental bodies that are parties to the litigation at issue. *See id.* § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 638 at 2 (1996) (section 552.103 only protects the litigation interests of the governmental body claiming the exception). 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. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceedings); *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).

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.” 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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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.<sup>1</sup> *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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You argue the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the day it received the instant request for information. You explain that prior to the request, an article was published reflecting the former chief has not decided whether to pursue legal action against the city regarding his

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

discharge. However, we find you have not demonstrated the former chief has taken any objective steps towards the initiation of litigation. Thus, we find you have failed to establish the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 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. Section 552.111 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. ORD 615 at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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).

You seek to withhold the submitted information under section 552.111. You contend the information at issue contains advice, opinion, and recommendations relating to the city’s policy matters. Upon review, the information reflects it pertains to administrative and personnel issues involving only one city employee, the former chief, and you have not explained how the information pertains to administrative or personnel matters of a broad scope that affect the city’s policy mission. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate how

the deliberative process privilege applies to this information. Accordingly the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.111 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 551.104 of the Government Code. This section provides “[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3).” *Id.* § 551.104(c). Thus, such information cannot be released in response to an open records request. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-995 at 5-6 (1988) (public disclosure of certified agenda of closed meeting may be accomplished only under procedures provided in Open Meetings Act). However, other than certified agendas and tape recordings, records relating to closed meetings are not expressly made confidential by chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 485 at 6 (1987) (investigative report not excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101 simply by virtue of its having been considered in executive session); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection), 478 at 2 (1987) (as a general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). You state some of the information contained in the submitted memorandum consist of a council member’s notes taken during an executive session and closely mirrors the city’s certified executive session agenda. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated, nor does it appear, the information at issue consists of a certified agenda or tape. Therefore, the information you have marked may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” Gov’t Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106 of the Government Code resembles section 552.111 in that both exceptions protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 2 (1987). However, section 552.106 applies specifically to the legislative process and is narrower than section 552.111. *Id.* Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. *Id.* Section 552.106 does not protect purely factual information from public disclosure. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 344 at 3-4 (1982) (for purposes of statutory predecessor, factual information prepared by State Property Tax Board did not reflect policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals concerning drafting of legislation). You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.106 because they consist of documents prepared by a city council member, provided to a subordinate, the former chief, to provide feedback and direction regarding the former chief’s employment. Upon review of your arguments, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the information at issue pertains to the

preparation of proposed legislation. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques, but was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution); *but see* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You generally argue that release of the names of citizen complainants, which you have marked, would unduly interfere with law enforcement, because release of the names at issue could affect the willingness of citizens to act as complainants or eyewitnesses in future investigations. You cite to Open Records Decision No. 297 (1981) to support your arguments. *See* ORD 297 (names and statements of witnesses may be withheld if disclosure might subject witnesses to possible intimidation or harassment or harm prospects of future cooperation between witnesses and law enforcement). Here, however, we find you have failed to reasonably explain how release of the information at issue could subject these individuals to intimidation or harassment or chill the willingness of other individuals to come forward. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 329 (1982), 313, 297. Furthermore, we find you have failed to reasonably explain how release of the information would harm the prospects for future cooperation between witnesses and law enforcement officers. Therefore, we find you have not adequately demonstrated that release of this information would interfere with law enforcement, and we determine the information you have marked is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code in this instance.

Section 552.109 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held the

test to be applied to information under section 552.109 is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the information at issue constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.109 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the submitted information.

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](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,



Cynthia G. Tynan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

Ref: ID# 501264

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)