



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2015

Ms. Karla Schultz  
Counsel for the Hearne Independent School District  
Walsh Gallegos Treviño Russo & Kyle, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2156  
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2015-26979

Dear Ms. Schultz:

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# 591637.

The Hearne Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for three categories of information pertaining to a named former district employee; all information pertaining to district policies and procedures relating to discipline, counseling, and coaching of employees for performance deficiencies; all claims of discrimination or retaliation by district employees in the last five years; and documents regarding the performance of administrative assistants or receptionists in the last five years. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup> We have also received and considered the requestor's comments. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information).

Initially, we note you have only submitted information responsive to the first portion of the request. To the extent any information responsive to the rest of the request existed and was maintained by the district on the date the district received the instant request, we assume the

---

<sup>1</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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

district has released it. If the district has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *Id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we address the requestor's claim the district failed to timely request a ruling under the Act. Section 552.301 prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The district received the request for information on September 30, 2015. You state the district provided the requestor with a cost estimate pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code and required a deposit. *See id.* §§ 552.2615(a), .263(a). You state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the district received payment of the deposit on October 9, 2015. Thus, October 9, 2015 is the date on which the district is deemed to have received the request. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that the governmental body receives deposit or bond). Accordingly, the ten-business-day deadline for requesting a ruling from this office was October 23, 2015. The envelope in which the district submitted its request for a ruling was meter-marked October 12, 2015. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Therefore, we find the district complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

We note the submitted information contains an agenda of a public meeting of the district. The notices, agendas, and minutes of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See id.* §§ 551.041 (governmental body shall give written notice of date, hour, place, and subject of each meeting), .043 (notice of meeting of governmental body must be posted in place readily accessible to general public for at least 72 hours before scheduled time of meeting). Although you seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, as a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Accordingly, the district must release the agenda of the public meeting we have marked pursuant to chapter 551 of the Government Code.

We also note some of the remaining submitted information is 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains completed evaluations and performance appraisals which are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed evaluations and performance appraisals pursuant to subsection 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.* The district asserts this information is excepted from release under sections 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 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 your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). We will also consider your arguments under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information at issue.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent 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 to show the section 552.103(a) exception 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 of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the

information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated 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 from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. See Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). 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). Further, the fact that 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 state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the district’s receipt of the instant request, the district received a letter from the requestor, who represents the former district employee, seeking a resolution to the former employee’s potential legal claims. You explain the letter seeks to resolve the matter without litigation, and if the district does not respond to the letter, the requestor will be “forced to pursue all available remedies, damages and attorney fees.” Furthermore, you explain the letter states that if litigation is necessary, the district “is advised to locate and preserve all potential evidence relating to this potential/anticipated litigation.” Additionally, the district states the remaining information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request for information. We also find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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

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

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

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

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

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

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. Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *Id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not

waived the privilege or the document 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 extends to entire communication, including factual information).

You assert rule 503 for the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of attorney-client privileged communications. Accordingly, this information may not be withheld under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

In summary, the district must release the agenda of the public meeting we have marked pursuant to chapter 551 of the Government Code. The district must release the completed evaluations and performance appraisals we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 591637

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)