



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 10, 2015

Mr. Shan Rutherford
Counsel for the City of Bastrop
Law Offices of JC Brown PC
1411 West Avenue, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2015-25934

Dear Mr. Rutherford:

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# 590144.

The City of Bastrop (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent from or received by eighteen specified e-mail addresses during a specified time period and a specified contract and attachments. You state the city will release the specified contract and attachments to the requestor. You argue a portion of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. In addition and in the alternative, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the Act is applicable only to "public information." *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. "Public information" is defined in section 552.002 of the Government Code as:

¹We 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.

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Section 552.002(a-1) also provides the following:

Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). You state the information you have marked Exhibit I was not collected, assembled, or maintained in connection with the transaction of official city business. We note the information at issue consists of e-mails that are entirely personal in nature and have no connection with the city's business. See Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree the information at issue does not constitute "information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business" by or for the city. See Gov't Code

§ 552.002. Therefore, we conclude Exhibit I is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to the present request for information.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. You generally raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Utilities Code for the information you have marked Exhibit H. However, you do not cite to any confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that makes any of the information at issue confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

To establish that 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. *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. 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You assert the remaining information pertains to litigation reasonably anticipated by the city. To support this assertion you state the city has received “veiled threats” from the requestor’s company related to the award of the specified contract. You further state this requestor filed a previous request for information and the requestor’s company has a “pattern and practice of initiating litigation against municipalities and competitors[.]” Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any party had taken any concrete steps toward initiating litigation involving the city as of the date of the request. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request for information was received. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.103.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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 “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 have marked Exhibit F is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between the attorneys for the city and city officials, employees, and consultants. You indicate the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. We understand 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 city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) 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. This exception encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

(1) [M]aterial prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

You assert the information you have marked Exhibit G consists of attorney work product protected under section 552.111. You state the information at issue reflects materials prepared, mental impressions, and/or communications developed by attorneys for the city in anticipation of potential litigation. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the information at issue was prepared in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit G under section 552.111 of the Government Code as attorney work product.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”³ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, the city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not within the scope of section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, Exhibit I is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to the present request for information. The city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and Exhibit G under section 552.111 of the Government Code as attorney work product. The city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code and the e-mail addresses we have marked under

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release. The city 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.

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 "Tim Neal", written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 590144

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)