



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 27, 2016

Mr. Christopher Gregg
Counsel for the City of Shoreacres
Gregg & Gregg, P.C.
16055 Space Center Boulevard, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77062

OR2016-21758

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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# 627788 (ORR201607111457).

The City of Shoreacres (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's personnel file and termination, specified citations, and a specified arrest report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.137 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 not responsive to the present request because it was created after the date the city received the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the city need not release it in response to this request.

¹ Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.129 of the Government Code, we note section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Further, although you claim section 552.129 for some of the submitted information, we understand you to raise section 552.130 based on the substance of your argument.

Next, 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:

(a) [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 completed evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed evaluations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the completed evaluations, 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 have marked, may be withheld under section 552.103. However, you also raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), as well as the remaining information.

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 [required public disclosure] 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 [required public disclosure] 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). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information if its release would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Section 552.108(b)(1) protects internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with law enforcement and prosecution efforts. 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 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). This office has concluded 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. 474 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a governmental body has custody of information relating to a pending case of a different law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. You claim the submitted information is the subject of an active criminal investigation by the Harris County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office"). In this instance, however, the district attorney's office, which has the law enforcement interest in the information at issue, has advised this office that it does not object to the release of the information at issue. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate sections 552.108(a)(1) and 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code are applicable to the submitted information, and the city may not withhold any portion of it on that basis.

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). The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to

litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) applies 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 requested information 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.); ORD 551 at 4. The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* 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.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact 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 state that prior to the instant request, the city received e-mails from the requestor threatening to sue the city as a result of the actions taken against the requestor related to his employment with the city. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the requestor had taken any objective steps toward litigation against the city prior to the city’s receipt of the request. Thus, we conclude you failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation prior to the date it received the present request for information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

²In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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 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).

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, no writ). 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 assert portions of the submitted information in Exhibit B consist of communications among the city’s attorney, city officials, and city employees in their capacities as clients. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and its employees. You state the communications were made in confidence and not intended for third parties, and the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the submitted information in Exhibit B, which we have marked. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to any of the remaining

information; therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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.³ *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. We note the requestor has a right of access to his own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *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); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Accordingly, with the exception of the requestor’s date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

³ Section 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).

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).* Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, constitutes confidential medical records subject to the MPA. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

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 we have 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). You seek to withhold the private e-mail address of a government official who used her private e-mail address to conduct official government business. However, in *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.), the court concluded section 552.137 does not except from disclosure the private e-mail addresses of government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business. *Id.* at 250. Therefore, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the e-mail address at issue is excepted under section 552.137. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue on this ground.

In summary, this ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information we marked, and the city need not release it in response to the request. The city must release the completed evaluations we marked under section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Except for the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The

city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive information must be released to the requestor.⁴

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 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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/akg

Ref: ID# 627788

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note the information being released contains information to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a). If the city receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a decision from this office.