



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 30, 2016

Ms. Sarah Wolfe
Attorney
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
P.O. Box 13127
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2016-14913

Dear Ms. Wolfe:

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# 616768.

The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (the "commission") received a request for all documents related to a specified protest of four renewal permits involving named companies during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(17) provides the following:

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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(17). Although the commission asserts the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108, these sections are discretionary 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the commission may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or 552.108. However, we note section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act. Therefore, we will address your assertion of section 552.101 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also consider your arguments against disclosure for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

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.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is “realistically contemplated.” See Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld from disclosure if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is “reasonably likely to result”). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See ORD 452 at 4. We note contested cases conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act (the “APA”), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, are considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103. See Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991). We further note a contested case before the State Office of Administrative Hearings (“SOAH”) is considered litigation for the purposes of the APA. See *id.*

You inform us the commission has the authority to pursue contested cases under the Alcoholic Beverage Code. You state a protest was filed against multiple permit renewal applications for specified businesses. You explain if sufficient grounds for the protest exist, a contested case before the SOAH will be initiated. Based on your representations and our review, we determine the commission reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the instant request for information. Further, you state, and we agree, the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, we conclude the commission may withhold Exhibit B and the information in Exhibit C not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

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 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; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code provides as follows:

(a) “Private records.” as used in this section, means all records of a permittee, licensee, or other person other than the name, proposed location, and type of permit or license sought in an application for an original or renewal permit or license, or in a periodic report relating to the importation, distribution, or sale of alcoholic beverages required by the commission to be regularly filed by a permittee or licensee.

(b) The private records of a permittee, licensee, or other person that are required or obtained by the commission or its agents, in connection with an investigation or otherwise, are privileged unless introduced in evidence in a hearing before the commission or before a court in this state or the United States.

Alco. Bev. Code § 5.48. The term “privileged” in this statute has been construed to mean “confidential” for purposes of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-1235 at 2 (1990); Open Records Decision Nos. 186 (1978), 62 (1974). Thus, section 5.48 makes confidential any records required or obtained by the commission, with the exception of “the name, proposed location, and type of permit or license sought in an application for an original or renewal permit or license” and “a periodic report relating to the importation, distribution, or sale of alcoholic beverages required by the commission to be regularly filed by a permittee or licensee.” Alco. Bev. Code § 5.48(a).

You explain the information at issue consists of records provided to the commission by permittees during the licensing and investigation process. You state the information at issue has not been introduced as evidence in a hearing before the commission or before a court in Texas or the United States. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information at issue constitutes private records under section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code.

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 state the information in Exhibit D consists of communications involving attorneys for the commission and commission employees in their capacities as clients. You assert these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the commission. You assert these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the communications at issue. Therefore, the commission may generally withhold Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note one of the otherwise privileged e-mail strings includes an e-mail sent to or received from the requestor, a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if this e-mail is removed from the e-mail string and stands alone, it is responsive to the instant request. Therefore, if the commission maintains this non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then the commission may not withhold the non-privileged e-mail under section 552.107(1).

In summary, the commission may withhold Exhibit B and the information in Exhibit C not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code. The commission may generally withhold Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the commission maintains the non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then the commission may not withhold the non-privileged e-mail under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and it 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,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/akg

Ref: ID# 616768

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)