



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 25, 2022

Ms. Kacey Villafuerte
Counsel for the Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Kyle & Robinson, P.C.
6770 West Expressway 83, Suite 301
Harlingen, Texas 78552

OR2022-32980

Dear Ms. Villafuerte:

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# 976890 (PIA# 0166).

The Uvalde Consolidated Independent School District (the “district”), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a former employee.¹ You state the district does not have information responsive to a portion of the request.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ We note the district 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).

² The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2022-31228. In Open Records Letter No. 2022-31228, we determined the district must withhold some the information at issue and release the remainder. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 22022-31228 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling.³ See Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (discussing criteria for first type of previous determination). We will address the district's arguments against release of the submitted information that is not encompassed by Open Records Letter No. 2022-31228.

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

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

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 at issue consists of communications between the attorneys for the district and district officials. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. 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 district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications made for the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107.

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[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 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). 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. 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[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 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). 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

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

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 state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) objects to release of the information relating to its ongoing criminal investigation. Based on DPS’s representation and our review, we conclude the release of some of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of DPS.⁵ We note section 552.108 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.108 subject to waiver)*. Thus, the district has the discretion to release all or part of the submitted information that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov’t Code § 552.007. However, we find you have not demonstrated how release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) 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.

Id. § 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

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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).

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

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the current or honorably retired peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and

552.1175 of the Government Code.⁶ *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(2), 552.003(1-b)) (defining "honorably retired" for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, "family member" means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person's home. *See id.* § 552.117(c) (providing that "family member" has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In this instance we are unable to determine whether the individual at issue is a currently licensed or honorably retired peace officer; therefore, we must rule conditionally. If the individual at issue is a currently-licensed or honorably retired peace officer, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual at issue is not a currently-licensed or honorably retired peace officer, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the individual at issue is not a currently licensed or honorably retired peace officer, the information at issue may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). As noted above, for purposes of section 552.117, "family member" means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person's home. *See id.* § 552.117(c). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 22022-31228 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. If the individual at issue is a currently-licensed or honorably retired peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code

⁶ 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).

of Criminal Procedure, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the individual at issue is not a current or honorably retired peace officer and to the extent the individual timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, then the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district 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/jxd

Ref: ID# 976890

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)