



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 17, 2019

Mr. Ramon G. Viada III  
Counsel for the City of Cold Springs  
Viada & Strayer  
17 Swallow Tail Court  
The Woodlands, Texas 77381

OR2019-16362

Dear Mr. Viada:

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# 771306 (Coldspring 19-001).

The City of Coldspring (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a named employee; a specified bid; allegations of workplace harassment; certain statements in city council meetings; meeting minutes for a specified executive session; and meeting minutes and notes regarding appointment to city council. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we address the requestor's contention that the city did not comply with the procedural requirements of the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(d) of the Government Code, a governmental body must provide the requestor with (1) a written statement that the governmental body wishes to withhold the requested information and has asked for a decision from the attorney general, and (2) a copy of the governmental body's written

---

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

communication to the attorney general within ten business days of receiving the request for information. *Id.* § 552.301(d). The requestor asserts he was not timely notified of the request for ruling at issue as required by section 552.301(d) of the Government Code. The city states it received the requests for information on April 2, 2019 and April 9, 2019. Thus, the ten-business-day deadline to provide information to the requestor pursuant to section 552.301(d) was April 16, 2019. The envelope in which the city submitted to this office the information required by section 552.301(b) is postmarked April 12, 2019. The request for a ruling indicates the requestor was copied on that correspondence. *See id.* § 552.308(a) (prescribing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the requestor has failed to establish the city did not comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(d) of the Government Code. Accordingly, we will address the arguments of the city to withhold the information at issue.

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.

*Id.* § 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).

You state that, at the time of the request, *Boudreaux v. City of Coldspring*, Cause No. CV15,835 was pending in the 258th Judicial District Court of San Jacinto County, Texas, when the city received the instant requests for information. You further explain Exhibit 4 is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find litigation was pending when the city received the requests for information, and Exhibit 4 is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section

552.103. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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 Exhibit 5 consists of communications between city attorneys and officials that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on

your representations and our review, we find Exhibit 5 consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit 5 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit 5 under section 552.107(1) 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](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,



D. Michelle Case  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DMC/mo

Ref: ID# 771306

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)