



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2015

Ms. Kaye H. Edwards
City Attorney
City of Big Spring
310 Nolan Street
Big Spring, Texas 79720-2657

OR2015-26382

Dear Ms. Edwards:

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# 590826.

The City of Big Spring (the "city") received a request for 1) all letters to the Office of the Attorney General regarding the requestor, and 2) all e-mails from the city pertaining to the requestor, or with mentions of his name or his case.¹ The city states it has released the information responsive to the first item of the request to the requestor. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103

¹The city states it sought and received clarification of the request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

and 552.107 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108; [and]

...

(15) information regarded as open to the public under an agency's policies[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (15). The submitted information contains completed investigations subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). Additionally, the submitted information includes a job description, which is generally open to the public as part of a job posting. If the city regards the submitted job description as open to the public, then this information is subject to section 552.022(a)(15) and the city may only withhold the job description if it is made confidential under the Act or other law. The city asserts the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from release under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be

²Although the city raised sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code within the ten-business-day time period as required by section 552.301(b), the city did not raise section 552.101 until after the ten-business-day deadline had passed. Thus, we find the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(b) of the Government Code with respect to its claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(b) (requiring governmental body to ask for ruling and state exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving written request). Nonetheless, section 552.101 is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Thus, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the submitted information, notwithstanding the city's violation of section 552.301.

waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the city’s assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the completed investigations. Further, as section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential, we will consider the city’s argument under this exception for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). We will also address the city’s arguments under section 552.103 and section 552.107 for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

The city raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for some of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.101 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 information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer’s civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), the officer’s civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer’s supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)–(3). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051–.055. In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer’s misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer’s civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.).

All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or are in the possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer’s civil service file if the

police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

Id. In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g) to "information reasonably related to a police officer's or fire fighter's employment relationship"); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

The city states the information at issue is contained within the city police department's internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on the city's representation and our review, we find the information we have marked is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.³

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

The city states the remaining information subject to section 552.022 consists of confidential communications involving city attorneys, legal staff, and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the

information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of The Texas Rules of Evidence.⁴

Next, we address the city's argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides, in relevant 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.

Gov't Code § 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 it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) 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, orig. proceeding); *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. *See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To demonstrate 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.* This office has found a pending complaint with the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission ("EEOC") indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982), 281 at 1 (1981).*

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

The city asserts the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city states, and the submitted information reflects, prior to the city's receipt of the request for information, the requestor filed a discrimination complaint with the EEOC against the city, and subsequently, the EEOC issued a right to sue letter. The city further states, and provides documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the request for information, the requestor filed suit in district court against the city and litigation is pending. Based on these representations and our review, we find litigation was pending on the date the request was received. We also find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, the remaining information at issue is generally subject to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Upon review, we find the information we have marked has been seen by the opposing party and may not be withheld under section 552.103. Therefore, with the exception of the information we have marked, the city may withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁵ We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Next, we address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of the remaining information to which the opposing party has seen or had access. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923 (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The city states the remaining information consists of communications between city attorneys, legal staff, and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

However, we note the information at issue was communicated with non-privileged parties. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.107(1) 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* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We note the requestor has a right of access to his own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *See id.* § 552.137(b). Accordingly, with the exception of the requestor’s e-mail address, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or if subsection (c) applies.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. In releasing the information, with the exception of the requestor’s e-mail address, the city must withhold the submitted e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or if subsection (c) applies.⁶

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

⁶We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Thus, the city must request another ruling from this office if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 590826

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)