



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 5, 2014

Mr. Gary B. Lawson
Counsel for the Dallas Police and Fire Pension System
Strasburger & Price, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 4400
Dallas, Texas 75202-3794

OR2014-07479

Dear Mr. Lawson:

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# 521668 (Tettamant Correspondence Request).

The Dallas Police and Fire Pension System (the "system"), which you represent, received a request for written correspondence between a named individual and any of four other named individuals from a specified period of time. You indicate the system will withhold information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.143 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and

¹Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c).

rule 192.3 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.² We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you argue some of the responsive information is privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.3 and Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We note this office generally does not address discovery and evidentiary rules that may or may not be applicable to information submitted to our office by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 416 (1984) (finding that even if evidentiary rule specified that certain information may not be publicly released during trial, it would have no effect on disclosability under Act). However, the Texas Supreme Court has ruled that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022 (enumerating several categories of information not excepted from required disclosure unless expressly confidential under the Act or other law); *see also In re City of Georgetown*, 53S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). In this instance, the responsive information does not fall into one of the categories of information made expressly public by section 552.022 of the Government Code. Accordingly, we conclude the system may not withhold any portion of the responsive information pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure or the Texas Rules of Evidence.

You claim some of the information at issue is protected under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides, in 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 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.

²We note, although you also raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022. Additionally, although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.3, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate 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 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.). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue 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.³ *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 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).*

You contend the system reasonably anticipates litigation because it is currently in a dispute with the Nasher Sculpture Center (the "Nasher"). You explain the Nasher has made allegations that glare emanating from the glass walls of the Museum Tower, a high-rise residential condominium owned by the system, is damaging the Nasher's art and vegetation and creating an unpleasant experience for visitors. You state representatives of the Museum Tower and the Nasher recently participated in mediation efforts which were unsuccessful. You indicate all efforts short of litigation to resolve the dispute have failed and state the system anticipates being a party to any suit regarding the Museum Tower and you argue there would be legal and financial recourse against the system as a result of any suit. Based on your representations and our review, we determine the system has established it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. We also find the

³In addition, this office has concluded that 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)*.

information at issue is related to litigation the system anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information. Accordingly, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103.⁴

However, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.143 of the Government Code provides, in part,

(c) All information regarding a governmental body's direct purchase, holding, or disposal of restricted securities that is not listed in Section 552.0225(b)(2)-(9), (11), (13)-(16) is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. This subsection does not apply to a governmental body's purchase, holding, or disposal of restricted securities for the purpose of reinvestment nor does it apply to a private investment fund's investment in restricted securities.

Gov't Code § 552.143(c). You argue the remaining information pertains to the system's direct purchase, holding, or disposal of a restricted security. *See id.* § 552.143(d)(3) (defining "restricted securities" for purposes of section 552.143); *see also* 17 C.F.R. § 230.144(a)(3) (defining "restricted securities" as "securities acquired directly or indirectly from the issuer, or from an affiliate of the issuer, in a transaction or chain of transactions not involving public offering"). You inform us the submitted information involves Museum Tower, L.P., which you state is not a governmental body. You state the system's limited partnership interest in the Museum Tower, L.P., is a security acquired directly from the issuer of the security, the Museum Tower, L.P., in a transaction that did not involve a public offering. Upon review, we find the system has failed to demonstrate how the remaining information pertains to the system's direct purchase, holding, or disposal of a restricted security. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.143.

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. This exception 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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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, writ ref'd n.r.e.); 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 assert the information you have marked under section 552.111 consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of system employees and officials relating to policymaking matters of the system. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, we find none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarah Casterline', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 521668

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)