



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 8, 2015

Ms. Lisa Calem-Lindström  
Public Information Coordinator  
Texas Facilities Commission  
P.O. Box 13047  
Austin, Texas 78711-3047

OR2015-13831

Dear Ms. Calem-Lindstrom:

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# 570739.

The Texas Facilities Commission (the "commission") received two requests from different requestors for communications containing specified terms sent to or from a named individual during a specified time period. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.116 for portions of the submitted information, you provide no arguments explaining how this exception is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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

Initially, we note some of the submitted information may have been the subject of previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2013-15830 (2013) and 2015-02527 (2015). There is no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, for the requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the commission must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2013-15830 and 2015-02527 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

We note you seek to withhold portions of the submitted information, some of which may have been previously released pursuant to Open Records Letter Nos. 2013-15830 and 2015-02527, under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.007 of the Government Code, however, provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the commission may not now withhold any previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. We note sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 do not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. *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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8-10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 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). Thus, to the extent any of the submitted information was previously released pursuant to Open Records Letter Nos. 2013-15830 and 2015-02527, the commission may not now withhold it under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111. We will consider your arguments for the submitted information that was not at issue in the prior rulings.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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). A governmental body 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 (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. 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). See ORD 551.

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." See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it has received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state, prior to the commission's receipt of the instant request for information, the commission received a notice of claim against the commission. You affirmatively state the notice of claim meets the requirements of the TTCA. Based on your representations, we find the commission reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the requests for information. You further state, and we agree, the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the commission may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the 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

that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the anticipated 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 or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate 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 Tex. 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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, orig. proceeding). 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 claim the information you marked is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between the commission’s attorney and commission staff members. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential and

have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the commission may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>4</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously submitted to and ruled on by this office, the commission must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2013-15830 and 2015-02527 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. The commission may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The commission must release the remaining 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.

---

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

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kenny Moreland', written in a cursive style.

Kenny Moreland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 570739

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)