



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2015

Mr. Matthew L. Grove  
Assistant County Attorney  
Fort Bend County  
401 Jackson Street, Third Floor  
Richmond, Texas 77469

OR2015-13261

Dear Mr. Grove:

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# 567336.

The Fort Bend County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for (1) all records related to two specified case numbers; (2) all records related to the requestor; (3) all call slips for a specified time period at the requestor's address; and (4) any remaining records related to the requestor's address. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the*

*Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

You assert the request requires the sheriff's office to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning an individual, thus implicating the individual's privacy interests. However, the requestor, in part, asks for all information held by the sheriff's office concerning herself. The requestor has a right of access to her own private information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Additionally, the requestor also seeks information pertaining to specified cases; thus, this portion of the request does not require the sheriff's office to compile an individual's criminal history and does not implicate the privacy interests of any individual. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy as a criminal history.

Next, we note portions of the information submitted as Exhibit D 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:

...

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

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted information contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). The sheriff's office must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under sections 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions) 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Thus, the information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.107, section 552.108, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has

held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, which protects information made confidential under law. We will, therefore, consider your assertions of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and section 552.101 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also consider your arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022.

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:

- (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).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) was communicated between attorneys for Fort Bend County (“county”) and county employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county and these communications were intended to be confidential. However, all of the information at issue was shared with non-privileged parties. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes privileged communications for purposes of rule 503. Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney’s representative. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat’l Tank 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. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of

an attorney or an attorney's representative. See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is privileged under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). See *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 425 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, the governmental body may assert the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the core work product aspect of the privilege. See ORD 677 at 5-6. In *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. 1994), the Texas Supreme Court determined a request for a district attorney's "entire file" was "too broad" and, citing *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." *Curry*, 873 S.W.2d at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file, and a governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996). However, we note the court in *National Union* also concluded a specific document is not automatically considered to be privileged simply because it is part of an attorney's file. 863 S.W.2d at 461. The court held an opposing party may request specific documents or categories of documents that are relevant to the case without implicating the attorney work product privilege. *Id.*; ORD 647 at 5.

You assert the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) pertains to litigation the Fort Bend County Attorney's Office ("county attorney's office") filed against the requestor. You claim the information at issue includes items prepared by county attorneys or their representatives in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for litigation, or reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of attorneys for the county. As noted above, the submitted information was disclosed to non-privileged parties. We note the attorney work product privilege can be waived if privileged information is voluntarily disclosed in a non-privileged context. See *Axelson*, 798 S.W.2d at 554; *Carmona v. State*, 947 S.W.2d 661, 663 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no writ); *Arkla, Inc. v. Harris*, 846 S.W.2d 623, 630 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ); *State v. Peca*, 799 S.W.2d 426, 431 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1990, no writ). Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is

confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.<sup>1</sup> However, the sheriff's office has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information consists of a physician-patient communication or a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 611.002 provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b). Section 611.001 defines a "professional" as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of a mental health record for purposes of chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Next, we address your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You seek to withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code. These sections provide, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). A governmental body claiming an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* §§ 552.108, .301(e)(1)(A); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). The sheriff's office contends the information in Exhibit D was prepared by an assistant county attorney in anticipation of or in preparation for trial. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the information at issue was prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation or reflects the mental processes or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(4) or section 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code.

The sheriff's office claims section 552.107 of the Government Code for the remaining information in Exhibit D. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those for rule 503, which are discussed above. 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. *See Huie*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state the information at issue is contained in communications between attorneys for the county and county employees. You state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county and were intended to be confidential. Upon review, we find you may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, the information at issue contains e-mails shared with non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are not maintained by the sheriff's office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the sheriff's office may withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, the sheriff's office may not withhold the marked e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we find the remaining information in Exhibit D was shared with individuals you have not demonstrated are privileged parties. Accordingly, none of the remaining information in Exhibit D may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v.*

*Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD 677 at 4-8. As previously discussed, 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. The test to determine whether information was created or developed in anticipation of litigation is the same as that discussed previously concerning rule 192.5.

The work product doctrine under section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry*, 873 S.W.2d at 381; *see U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). As stated previously, the Texas Supreme Court determined a request for a district attorney's "entire file" was "too broad" and held "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." *Curry*, 873 S.W.2d at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file, and a governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. ORD 647 at 5; *see Nat'l Union*, 863 S.W.2d at 461 (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes). Additionally, as stated previously, the court in *National Union* also concluded a specific document is not automatically considered to be privileged simply because it is part of an attorney's file. 863 S.W.2d at 461. The court held an opposing party may request specific documents or categories of documents that are relevant to the case without implicating the attorney work product privilege. *Id.*; ORD 647 at 5.

As previously noted, you assert the information at issue in Exhibit D pertains to litigation the county attorney's office filed against the requestor and a portion of the present request for information encompasses the entire litigation file for the specified incident that was the basis for the litigation. However, the requestor does not seek the litigation file of the county attorney's office, but only information maintained by the sheriff's office; thus, the rationale underlying *Curry* is not applicable to the information at issue requested from the sheriff's office. Thus, we conclude *Curry* is inapplicable. You also claim the information at issue

includes items prepared by county attorneys or their representatives in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for litigation, or reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of attorneys for the county. Upon review, we find the remaining information in Exhibit D consists of information that was sent to or received from third parties you have not demonstrated are privileged. Therefore, because non-privileged parties have had access to this information, the work product privilege under section 552.111 has been waived for this information. Furthermore, we find you have failed to establish the information at issue consists of material prepared, mental impressions developed, or communications made in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for the county. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit D as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the information in Exhibit C pertains to criminal cases that concluded in results other than convictions or deferred adjudications. Based on your representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to Exhibit C.

We note, however, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the sheriff's office may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects the specific types of information the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. Types of information considered intimate or 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

---

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

No. 455 (1987). However, the requestor is the individual whose privacy interest is at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to information pertaining to herself that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the basic information in Exhibit C from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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).<sup>3</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure, the sheriff's office must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, including the personal e-mail addresses we marked in the non-privileged e-mails if the e-mails are maintained by the sheriff's office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the sheriff's office must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The sheriff's office may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails we marked are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, the sheriff's office may not withhold the marked e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the sheriff's office may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The sheriff's office must release the remaining information.<sup>4</sup>

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>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).

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access beyond that of the general public to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the sheriff's office receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the sheriff's office must again seek a ruling from this office.

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 "Rustam Abedinzadeh". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Rustam" and last name "Abedinzadeh" clearly distinguishable.

Rustam Abedinzadeh  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RA/dls

Ref: ID# 567336

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)