



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 16, 2017

Mr. Michael Shaunessy  
Counsel for the City of Hutto  
McGinnis Lochridge, LLP  
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2017-13456

Dear Mr. Shaunessy:

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# 662402.

The City of Hutto (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent to or from two named city officials on specified dates. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.104, 552.105, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note you have marked some information as not responsive. This decision does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information and that information need not be released. However, we note a governmental body must make a good faith effort to relate a request to information held by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990). Upon review, we find all of the information you submitted to be responsive to the request. We will therefore address your claimed exceptions for the entirety of the submitted information.

---

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

Next, we note portions of the requested information may have been the subject of previous requests for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2017-11094 (2017), 2017-11238 (2017), 2017-11590 (2017), and 2017-12053 (2017). We note the Act does not permit selective disclosure of information to the public. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007 (b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). Thus, as a general rule, if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to a member of the public, the information may not subsequently be withheld from another member of the public, unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988). You raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for some of the submitted information. We note section 552.103 is a discretionary exception that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *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 section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 does not prohibit the release of information or make information confidential. Thus, to the extent the information responsive to the instant request was released in response to the previous requests, it may not now be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. There is no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the remaining requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2017-11094, 2017-11238, 2017-11590, and 2017-12053 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the information at issue is not identical to the information responsive in these previous rulings, we will address your submitted arguments against its disclosure.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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 (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that 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 under section 552.103(a). See ORD 551.

The question of 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 Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) and a pending complaint with the Texas Workforce Commission (the “TWC”) indicate litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982).

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the instant request for information, three former city employees filed charges of discrimination with the EEOC and the TWC. You further state a named attorney has informed the city she represents several additional city employees planning on filing suit against the city. You assert, and we agree, the information you have marked is directly related to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date this request was received. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, 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).

---

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

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). Although the city raises section 552.104, we find it has failed to demonstrate the release of the information you have marked would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.105 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

Gov’t Code § 552.105. We note this provision is designed to protect a governmental body’s planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 564 (1990), 357 (1982), 310 (1982). Information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted from disclosure so long as the transaction relating to that information is not complete. *See* ORD 310. Under section 552.105, a governmental body may withhold information “which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] ‘planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.’” ORD 357 at 3 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body’s planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body’s good-faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. *See* ORD 564.

You generally state section 552.105 applies to the information you have marked. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue pertains to the location, appraisal, or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose. *See* ORD 310 (statutory predecessor to section 552.105 protects information relating to the location, appraisals, and purchase price of property to be purchased by governmental body for public purpose). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.105 of the Government 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 remaining information you have marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information you have marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy,

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of a person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers not protected under privacy). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts 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 who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for the information is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was made. Accordingly, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city may not withhold this information if the individuals whose information is at issue did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

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

---

<sup>4</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).

address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We are unable to determine whether the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the city, belong to city officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of city officials or employees, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and the city may not withhold them on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). To the extent the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city officials or employees, this information is subject to section 552.137 and the city must withhold them under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release or subsection (c) applies.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2017-11094, 2017-11238, 2017-11590, and 2017-12053 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code and the remaining information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city officials or employees, this information is subject to section 552.137 and the city must withhold them under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release or subsection (c) applies. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/tdw

Ref: ID# 662402

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)