



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 15, 2020

Ms. Chelsea A. Mikulencak
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2020-10945

Dear Ms. Mikulencak:

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# 822108 (COSA File Nos. W3002309, W).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received forty requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified investigation, including communications and documents containing specified terms; employment records pertaining to named city employees; and records related to a certain law firm. You state the city does not maintain information responsive to one of the requests.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

² 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(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:

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

...

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

Id. § 552.022(a)(1), (16). The submitted information includes a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and an attorney fee bill that is subject to section 552.022(a)(16). The information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) must be released unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The information subject to section 552.022(a)(16) must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code and the information subject to section 552.022(a)(16) under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, these are discretionary exceptions 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. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived); 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally); 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Thus, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we marked, under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(16). Additionally, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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

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). Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document 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 assert the submitted attorney fee bill must be withheld in its entirety under rule 503. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides information "that is in a bill for attorney's fees" is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See* also Open Records Decisions Nos. 676 (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)), 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney's legal advice). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the fee bill at issue in its entirety under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

You state the information at issue consists of communications between outside counsel for the city and city staff that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you state the communications at issue were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, the remaining information at issue either does not document a communication for purposes of rule 503 or documents communications with an individual you have not established to be a privileged party. Thus, we find you failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state information at issue consists of communications involving attorneys for the city, including outside counsel, and city employees 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 you have established the information at issue, which we marked, consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³ We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1).

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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 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 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). ORD 551 at 4.

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 that 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.* 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 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"). 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).

Although you claim section 552.103 for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, we find you have failed to demonstrate any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the city prior to the dates the city received the instant requests for information. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 to the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.103(c) (governmental body must demonstrate that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on or before the date it received request for information), .301 (e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”⁴ *Id.* § 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 excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and 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). This office has also determined a public employee’s net pay is protected by common-law privacy even though it involves a financial transaction between the employee and the governmental body. *See* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 3-5 (2007) (net salary necessarily involves disclosure of information about personal financial decisions and is background financial information about a given individual that is not of legitimate concern to public). 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 some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(16) 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 firefighter or volunteer firefighter or emergency medical services personnel as defined by Section 773.003 of the Health and Safety Code, regardless of whether the current or former employee complies with section 552.024 or 552.1175. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(16). Section 552.117 also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Accordingly, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers

⁴ 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).

we marked under section 552.117(a)(16) of the Government Code, unless the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “a firefighter or volunteer firefighter or emergency medical services personnel as defined by section 773.003, Health and Safety Code.” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(15). Accordingly, to the extent the information we marked relates to an individual who is subject to section 552.1175(a) and who elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold this information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual whose information is at issue is not subject to section 552.1175(a) or does not elect to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then this information may not be withheld under section 552.1175.⁵

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 address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city may generally withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we marked under section 552.117(a)(16) of the Government Code, unless the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the information at issue relates to an individual who is subject to section 552.1175(a) and who elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. The city must release the

⁵ Regardless of the applicability of section 552.1175 of the Government Code, we note 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* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

remaining information.⁶

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,

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/be

Ref: ID# 822108

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁶ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person or a person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.