



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 12, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Slack  
Assistant District Attorney  
Lubbock County  
P.O. Box 10536  
Lubbock, Texas 79408

OR2019-09933

Dear Ms. Slack:

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# 759101 (ORR 1255).

The Lubbock County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for e-mails sent to or from any person in the Lubbock County Medical Examiner's Office (the "medical examiner's office") and a named individual during a specified time period. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of NAAG Pathology Labs ("NAAG"). Accordingly, you state you notified NAAG of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from NAAG. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides 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 that 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 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).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing 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 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.<sup>1</sup> *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). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the

---

<sup>1</sup>In 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).

governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect litigation is “realistically contemplated.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body attorney determines it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and 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.

You assert the district attorney’s office anticipates litigation because “several former employees of the medical examiner’s office may attempt to make various employment related claims as they were part of a reduction in force.” You also state the district attorney’s office may face claims from a former employee, arising from her termination, a former contractor, and a county commissioner. You further state a report was made to “law enforcement regarding illegal activity at the [medical examiner’s office] . . . and referred to the Texas Rangers for a criminal investigation.” However, you have not informed this office of the date this alleged report was made. Further, the district attorney’s office has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation when the district attorney’s office received the request for information. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the district attorney’s office reasonably anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103 when the district attorney’s office received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the district attorney’s office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking

functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

We note section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (Gov't Code § 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). In order for section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

You seek to withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You assert the information at issue reflects advice and recommendations of employees of Lubbock County (the "county") and an outside contractor working on behalf of the county regarding policymaking matters of the county. Based upon your representations and our review, we find the district attorney's office may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the remaining information consists of information that addresses administrative matters, is purely factual in nature, or does not relate to the policymaking matters of the district attorney's office. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how

the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district attorney's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information 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](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,



Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/gw

Ref: ID# 759101

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)