



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 10, 2022

Ms. Nicole J. Anchondo
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1980
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2022-07299

Dear Ms. Anchondo:

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# 934563 (City's Ref. No. 21-1020-1341).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's client. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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). The submitted information includes a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information, which we

¹ Although you raised section 552.101, you make no arguments in support of this assertion, nor have you marked any information as being excepted under this section. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn this exception. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

marked, 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.* Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information at issue, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), which we marked, may be withheld under section 552.103. As no other exceptions are raised, this information must be released. However, we will consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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 “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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was

reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

We understand that, concurrent with the city’s receipt of the request for information, the city received a notice of claim letter from the requestor, an attorney whose client was injured by an agent of the city. You do not affirmatively state the letter meets the requirements of the TTCA; thus, we will only consider the letter as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation pertaining to the incident at issue. Nevertheless, upon review and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation related to the matter at issue. You further state the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to litigation that was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the request for information. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through 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 or anticipated 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* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), 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).

The city claims Exhibit C is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city states the information at issue consists of communications involving the attorneys for the city and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city further states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may generally withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and an attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails and attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails and attachment, 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 and attachment under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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).² *See Gov’t Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section

² 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).*

552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must release the information we marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.103 of the Government Code. If these non-privileged e-mails and attachment, which we marked, is 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 and attachment under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.³

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,

Pearlie Gault
Attorney
Open Records Division

PG/ba

Ref: ID# 934563

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.