



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 30, 2017

Mr. Joseph E. Hoffer  
Counsel for BASIS Texas Charter Schools  
Schulman, Lopez, Hoffer, and Adelstein, L.L.P.  
517 Soledad Street  
San Antonio, Texas 78205-1508

OR2017-14726

Dear Mr. Hoffer:

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# 665483.

BASIS Texas Charter Schools ("Basis"), which you represent, received five separate requests from the same requestor for (1) all communications with Pape Dawson Engineers ("Pape Dawson") during a specified time period as well as all reports prepared by Pape Dawson related to a specified school project; (2) all communications with the Texas Department of Transportation related to a specified school project; (3) all communications with Kimley Horn during a specified time period as well as all reports prepared by Kimley Horn related to a specified school project; (4) all communications with the City of San Antonio during a specified time period; and (5) all communications with the City of Castle Hills during a specified time period. You state Basis does not have information responsive to part of the request pertaining to communication with the City of San Antonio.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

of information.<sup>2</sup> We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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.

*Id.* § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

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 showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture. *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

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume that 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.

for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* 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 argue Basis reasonably anticipates litigation because the requestor, a lawyer, has been actively involved in community organizing against the new school construction project at issue in the request. You state the instant requestor and several other persons have made several requests for information similar to the instant request, and appeared in open forums stating their opposition to the school project at issue. You also inform us the requestor’s law firm intervened in a hearing regarding a consent decree to which the City of Castle Hills was a party; however, you indicate Basis was not a party to this litigation which has concluded. Upon review, we find Basis has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when Basis received the instant request for information. Thus, we find Basis has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, Basis may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to personal 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) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, Basis must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, Basis may not withhold the cellular telephone number if a governmental body pays for the employee's cell phone service. Conversely, to the extent the employee whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, Basis may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.137 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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether some of the personal e-mail addresses at issue, which we marked, belong to government employees or officials. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the personal e-mail addresses at issue in the remaining information belong to government officials or employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld 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)). However, to the extent the personal e-mail addresses at issue are not the personal e-mail addresses of government officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, Basis must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, Basis may not withhold the cellular telephone number if a governmental body pays for the employee's cell phone service. To the extent the personal e-mail addresses we marked are not the personal e-mail addresses of government officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. Basis must release the remaining information.

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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/bw

Ref: ID# 665483

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)