



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 9, 2022

Ms. Elizabeth Medina
Paralegal - Office of the General Counsel
Garland Independent School District
501 South Jupiter Road
Garland, Texas 75042

OR2022-34945

Dear Ms. Medina:

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# 983622 (Ref. No. G000328-081822).

The Garland Independent School District (the "district") received a request for certain information sent to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services pertaining to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from a representative of the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(15) information regarded as open to the public under an agency's policies; [and]

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(3), (15), (17). The submitted information contains information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the district that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information also includes information that the district posts on its website. Thus, we find the district considers this information to be open to the public under the district's policies, and therefore, is subject to section 552.022(a)(15). Further, the submitted information also contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 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. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the submitted argument under section 552.101 for the information at issue. Further, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information at issue. Additionally, we will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 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. You assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the federal Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), chapter 552 of the United States Code. We note FOIA is applicable to information held by an agency of the federal government. In this instance, the information at issue is held by the district, which is subject to the laws of the State of Texas. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979) (FOIA exceptions apply to federal

agencies, not to state agencies); Open Records Decision Nos. 496 (1988), 124 (1976); *see also Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1980) (state governments are not subject to FOIA); Open Records Decision No. 561 at 7 n.3 (1990) (noting federal authorities may apply confidentiality principles found in FOIA differently from way in which such principles are applied under Texas open records law). This office has stated in numerous opinions that information in the possession of a governmental body of the State of Texas is not confidential or excepted from disclosure merely because the same information is or would be confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *See, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion MW-95; ORD 124 (fact that information held by federal agency is excepted by FOIA does not necessarily mean that same information is excepted under Act when held by Texas governmental body). Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of FOIA.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon

a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the district may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

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 district 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 district received the instant 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 district received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You assert the information at issue is protected by the attorney-client privilege. However, you have not explained, or otherwise demonstrated, the submitted information consists of confidential communications between privileged parties or a communication made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Consequently, the district may not withhold any portion of the information at issue 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).¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). However, 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). Therefore, the district must withhold all personal e-mail addresses within the submitted information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A

¹ 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 (1987).

governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district must withhold all personal e-mail addresses within the submitted information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.²

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/mo

Ref: ID# 983622

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Interested Party
(w/o enclosures)

² We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); ORD 481 at 4 (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the district receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district must again seek a decision from this office.