



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 19, 2022

Ms. Cynthia Trevino  
Counsel for the City of Uvalde  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, PC  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2022-32263

Dear Ms. Trevino:

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# 975813 (UV# 22-202).

The City of Uvalde (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified communications involving the mayor during a certain time period.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

We note some of the submitted information, which we have indicated, was the subject of previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2022-24126 (2022) and 2022-28491 (2022). We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2022-24126 and 2022-28491 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (discussing criteria

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</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.

for first type of previous determination). We will address the city's arguments against release of the submitted information that is not encompassed by the previous rulings.

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). 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 some of the remaining information consists of communications between city attorneys, city representatives, and city officials and employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

communications made for the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107.

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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

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 Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for

governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). 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 at 9.

You assert some of the remaining information consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of the city's staff and other parties with which the city shares a privity of interest regarding policymaking decisions. You also inform us the submitted information includes draft documents that reflect the deliberations of the city's staff. You state the final version of these draft documents has been released to the public in their final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> However, we find the remaining information consists of general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(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[.]

...

(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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information

---

<sup>4</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *See also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 414 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a governmental body has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. You assert the remaining information is excepted under section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1). Upon review, however, we find you have not demonstrated how release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides 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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (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)*. A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See ORD 551*.

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 establish 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"). 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).

You assert the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the city has not demonstrated the information at issue is related to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Consequently, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 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, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.<sup>5</sup> Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies to an elected public officer. *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(17). Some of the remaining information pertains to an individual who may be subject to section 552.1175(a)(17). Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175(a)(17) of the Government Code if it relates to an individual subject to that section and who elects to restrict access to that information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. If the individual either is not subject to section 552.1175(a)(17) or does not elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city may not withhold this information under section 552.1175.

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). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether some of the personal e-mail addresses at issue, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the city, belong to city officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of city employees or officials, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city employees or officials and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2022-24126 and 2022-28491 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 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 information we have marked under section 552.1175(a)(17) of the Government Code if it relates to an individual subject to that section and who elects to restrict access to that information in accordance

---

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

with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city employees or officials and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. 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,

Kelly McWethy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KM/pt

Ref: ID# 975813

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)