



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 14, 2016

Ms. Captoria Brown
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
City of Carrollton
1945 East Jackson Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2016-08415

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 606003 (City ID# 6697).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for all communications pertaining to the requestor or a specific entity, from within a specific date range. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.109, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has marked some of the submitted information as non-responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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

¹While the city does not raise sections 552.109, 552.117, and 552.130 in its brief to this office, we understand the city to raise these exceptions on the basis of its markings.

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 states the information it marked consists of confidential communications involving a city attorney and an employee in his capacity as a client. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. 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 withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.³ However, none of the remaining information the city has marked is of the type made confidential by section 552.117 of the Government Code and thus, none if it may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked under section 552.130 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). *See id.* § 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 have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to public disclosure. However, none of the remaining information the city has marked is of the type made confidential by section 552.137 of the Government Code and thus, none of it may be withheld on that basis.

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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.⁴ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Thus, the city must withhold the date of birth it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest and thus, none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

In summary, the city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to public disclosure. The city must withhold the date of birth it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining responsive 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.

⁴Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 606003

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)