



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 8, 2022

Ms. Kristine Nguyen  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2022-06889

Dear Ms. Nguyen:

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# 933778 (Ref. No. C010851-120221).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for certain communications with specified keywords during a stated period of time. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2021-30615 (2021). In that ruling, we determined the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information

---

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

previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2021-30615 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information is not encompassed by the previous ruling, we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

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

[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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Some of the submitted information pertains to completed investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) 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.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.111 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 section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code applies to confidential information, we will consider the submitted arguments under section 552.101 for the information at issue. Further, we will consider your arguments against release of the remaining information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, 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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) 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. *See 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). *See* ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter, prior to its receipt of a request for information, 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 that 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. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

You assert the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. However, upon review, we find you have not established any party had taken concrete steps toward filing a lawsuit when the city received the request for

information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Therefore, we find you have failed to establish litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the request for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 3616 of title 42 of the United States Code authorizes the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") to utilize the services of state and local fair housing agencies to assist in meeting its statutory mandate to enforce laws prohibiting discrimination. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3616. You state, pursuant to this authorization, the city's Office of Fair Housing and Human Rights ("FHO") is currently operating under a cooperative agreement with HUD in the investigation and resolution of complaints of housing discrimination. Section 301.063 of the Property Code states the Texas Workforce Commission shall receive, investigate, seek to conciliate, and act on complaints alleging violations of the Texas Fair Housing Act. *See* Prop. Code § 301.063. Then, upon the filing of a complaint, both federal and state law mirror each other in language and encourage conciliation to the extent feasible. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3610(b) (providing during the period beginning with the filing of a complaint and ending with the filing of a charge or a dismissal the Secretary of HUD shall, to the extent feasible, engage in conciliation); Prop. Code § 301.085 (providing that the commission shall, during the period beginning with the filing of a complaint and ending with the filing of a charge or a dismissal by the commission, to the extent feasible, engage in conciliation with respect to the complaint). Section 301.068 states the Texas Workforce Commission may refer a complaint to a municipality that is certified by HUD. *See* Prop. Code § 301.068.

You state the information you have marked relates to a housing discrimination complaint filed with the city under its cooperative agreement. You assert the information at issue is confidential under section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code and section 301.085 of the Property Code. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 3610(b); Prop. Code § 301.085. Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information made confidential by other statutes such as Section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code and section 301.085 of the Property Code. Section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code provides, in pertinent part:

(d) Prohibitions and requirements with respect to disclosure of information

- (1) Nothing said or done in the course of conciliation under this subchapter may be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this subchapter without the written consent of the persons concerned.

42 U.S.C. § 3610(d)(1). Section 301.085 of the Property Code provides, in pertinent part:

(e) Statements made or actions taken in the conciliation may not be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this chapter without the written consent of the persons concerned.

Prop. Code § 301.085(e). We note section 301.085(e) does not protect “conciliation efforts[;]” it protects “statements made or actions taken in the conciliation[.]” *Id.* Upon review, we note the information at issue consists of information related to housing discrimination complaints. Although you contend this information is protected under the federal and state laws, we find it consists of things neither said nor done in the course of conciliation. Further, we find the information at issue does not consist of either statements made or actions taken in conciliation. Accordingly, we find the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code or section 301.085(e) of the Property Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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). 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.*, 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 the information you have marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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).<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

In summary, the city may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2021-30615 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining 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,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/jxd

Ref: ID# 933778

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)