



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 26, 2020

Ms. Megan R. Santee
Counsel for the City of Bee Cave
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.
2500 West William Cannon Drive, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2020-21526

Dear Ms. Santee:

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# 841625.

The City of Bee Cave (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for three categories of information pertaining to specified state and city orders.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.106, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

The Act is applicable to information "written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official

¹ We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). We also note the requestor specifically excludes dates of birth, driver license numbers, social security numbers, and license plate numbers from her request.

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

business by a governmental body.” Gov’t Code § 552.002(a)(1). However, the Act’s definition of “governmental body” “does not include the judiciary.” *Id.* § 552.003(1)(B). Information “collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the judiciary” is not subject to the Act but is instead “governed by rules adopted by the Supreme Court of Texas or by other applicable laws and rules.” *Id.* § 552.0035(a); *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 131 (1976) (applying statutory predecessor to judiciary exclusion under Gov’t Code § 552.003(1)(B) prior to enactment of Gov’t Code § 552.0035). Therefore, the Act neither authorizes information held by the judiciary to be withheld, nor does it require such information be disclosed. *See* Open Records Decision No. 25 (1974). You state the information you indicated consists of judicial records collected, assembled, or maintained by the city on behalf of the judiciary. Accordingly, we conclude the information at issue, which consists of records of the judiciary, is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request for information.³

Next, you note, and we agree, some of the remaining information is not responsive to the present request because it does not pertain to any of the information requested by the requestor. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information you marked, and the additional information we marked, and the city need not release it in response to this request.⁴

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 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.

³ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁴ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 responsive information, you have failed to demonstrate any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the city when it received this request 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 responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” *Id.* § 552.106(a). Section 552.106(a) ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 1 (1987). The purpose of this exception is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body; therefore, section 552.106 encompasses only policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and does not except purely factual information from public disclosure. *Id.* at 2. The city argues some of the remaining responsive information is protected by section 552.106 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining responsive information at issue constitutes recommendations, opinions, or advice for purposes of section 552.106. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information at issue under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body

claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 generally is not applicable to purely administrative records that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002,, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). You generally state the release of some of the responsive information could pertain to criminal proceedings. However, you do not explain any of the responsive information at issue pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how release of any of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision No. 434 (1986). You state some of the responsive information pertains to criminal investigations that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. However, we note section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information at issue is related to a *concluded* criminal case “that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2) (emphasis added). Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to the remaining information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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). We note the information you indicated pertains to routine internal administrative and personnel matters. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue pertains to policymaking matters of the city for the purposes section 552.111 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the information you indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by this state or another state or country.⁵ Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 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." *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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, however, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information you indicated is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information.

⁵ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/mo

Ref: ID# 841625

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)