



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 7, 2022

Ms. Trilby Argubright
Counsel for the Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District
Walsh Gallegos Treviño Kyle & Robinson P.C.
P.O. Box 168046
Irving, Texas 75016-8046

OR2022-06778

Dear Ms. Argubright:

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# 929554.

The Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any materials and information responsive to a specified inquiry letter. Although the district takes no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, the district states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Representative Matt Krause, as Chairman of the Texas House of Representatives Committee on General Investigating (the "committee"), of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the committee. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 301.020(e) of the Government Code provides that "[i]nformation held by a general investigating committee is confidential and not subject to public disclosure except as provided by the rules of the house establishing the committee." *Id.* § 301.020(e). Upon

review, we find the committee has failed to demonstrate the submitted information is confidential under section 301.020(e) of the Government Code. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 on that basis.

The committee asserts the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Id. § 552.108(a)-(b). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). However, section 552.108 is applicable only to records created by an agency, or portion of an agency, whose primary function is to investigate crimes and enforce criminal laws. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 493 at 2 (1988), 287 (1981)*. We note the committee is not a law enforcement agency. In addition, the committee does not inform us any agency with a law enforcement interest seeks to withhold the information at issue. Therefore, we find the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the committee.

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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). 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.

The committee claims the submitted information is protected under the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the submitted information has been shared with individuals with whom the committee has failed to demonstrate it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find the committee has not shown the information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the committee. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district must release the submitted information.

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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/jm

Ref: ID# 929554

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)