



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 26, 2016

Ms. Kasey Feldman-Thomason
General Law Attorney
Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 13326
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2016-16816

Dear Ms. Feldman-Thomason:

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# 620321 (PUC ID# 2016-05-2012).

The Public Utility Commission of Texas (the "commission") received a request for all records of external communications regarding a specified transaction during a specified time period. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You further state the commission will redact some information under section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c).¹ We also understand the commission will redact information pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government

¹Section 552.117 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c).

²Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the representative sample of submitted information.³

Initially, we note you have marked certain information as not responsive. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the commission is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, you state the commission previously provided some of the responsive submitted information to specified members of the Texas Legislature pursuant to section 552.008 of the Government Code. Section 552.008(b) provides, in part, as follows:

[A] governmental body on request by an individual member, agency, or committee of the legislature shall provide public information, including confidential information, to the requesting member, agency, or committee for inspection or duplication in accordance with [the Act] if the requesting member, agency, or committee states that the public information is requested under [the Act] for legislative purposes.

Gov't Code § 552.008(b). We note that disclosure of excepted or confidential information to a legislator under section 552.008 does not waive or affect the confidentiality of the information or the right to assert exceptions in the future regarding that information, and section 552.008 provides specific procedures relating to the confidential treatment of the information. *Id.* Accordingly, we will address the commission's arguments against disclosure of the responsive information.

Further, we note the responsive information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[,]" unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(17). The commission seeks to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary exceptions 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 Nos. 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 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). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022 may not

³We 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.

be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, 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). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and your assertion of the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Further, we will address the commission’s arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

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 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 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. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information 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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You explain the information that is subject to section 552.022 consists of attachments to privileged e-mail communications between commission attorneys, attorneys representing the commission, and commission staff in their capacity as clients that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the commission. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the commission may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.⁴

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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 to show section 552.103(a) applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See 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 at 4.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information

To establish 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.” 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.⁵ *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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). Further, the fact 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 the commission reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. You inform us there was a pending contested case under the jurisdiction of the commission which pertains to the acquisition of a specified company. You state the commission issued an order granting regulatory approval of the acquisition of the specified company. In response to the commission’s approval, several parties filed motions for rehearing on the order approving the acquisition of the company. We understand, at the time of the request, there was an on-going dispute between the commission and the parties regarding the terms controlling the acquisition of the specified company. You inform us the commission denied the parties’ motion for rehearing. Based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the commission has established it reasonably anticipated litigation at the time it received the instant request. Furthermore, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Thus, the commission may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁶

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

⁵In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information

In summary, the commission may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The commission 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, 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,



Kavid Singh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KVS/bhf

Ref: ID# 620321

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)