



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2020

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the City of Cleburne
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2020-10037

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 819342.

The City of Cleburne (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified airport.¹ You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You also state the city will release some information to the requestor, including the city's meeting minutes and agendas. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, privileged under Texas Rule of

¹ We note we asked the city to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice).

² Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Civil Procedure 192.5, and protected under copyright law. You state release of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of the following third parties: 2L Construction; All About Rodents, Inc.; Buyers Barricades, Inc.; Duane Price Roofing & Remodeling; Dumas Land Surveying, Inc.; Five Star Landscaping & Irrigation; Garver, LLC; Lewis Contracting; Lone Star Roofing; Lyness Construction; Prime Source Construction; and Southwestern Testing Laboratories, LLC. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of the 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 considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, section 552.301(e)(1)(D) states a governmental body asking for an attorney general decision must, within fifteen business days of receiving a request, provide the attorney general with “a copy of the specific information requested, *or submit representative samples of information if a voluminous amount of information was requested*[.]” Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (emphasis added). We note you have submitted a voluminous amount of information rather than a representative sample. We have identified and reviewed a representative sample of the voluminous information submitted.³

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties may have in the information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

- (a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

³ To the extent the city identifies confidential information subject to a provision not addressed in this ruling, the city should contact the Open Government Hotline.

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body;

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege; [and]

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3), (16), (17). The submitted information includes completed reports that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the information at issue pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Additionally, we note the submitted information contains information in a contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3), attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16), and court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a) under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary in nature 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 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under these exceptions. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the city's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Further, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information at issue. Additionally, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

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). The governmental body claiming section 552.103 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).*

The city states, and provides documentation showing, prior to its receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *RT General v. City of Cleburne*, Cause No. DC-C201900937, was filed and is currently pending against the city in the 413th District Court of Johnson County, Texas. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. The city also states the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation though 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 pending 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*

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

Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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 not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You explain the information at issue consists of communications between city employees and attorneys for the city that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the

city. You state the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have established some of the information subject to section 552.022 constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we marked and indicated, under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.⁵ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals a communication with a party the city has identified as privileged or otherwise consists of privileged attorney client communications. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under rule 503.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the materials subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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, the city may withhold the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we marked and indicated, under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must release the remaining information subject to section 552.022; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Katie Stallcup
Attorney
Open Records Division

AKS/eb

Ref: ID# 819342

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

11 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)