



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 13, 2017

Mr. T. Daniel Santee  
Counsel for the City of Live Oak  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2017-05227

Dear Mr. Santee:

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# 648650.

The City of Live Oak (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent or received by two named city officials during a specified time period. We understand the city will release some information to the requestor upon his response to a cost estimate. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.130 of the Government Code. 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 instant request because it was created after the date the city received the request or does not involve either of the two named city officials. The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."<sup>1</sup> Gov't

---

<sup>1</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).

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in relevant part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), Emergency Medical Service (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091 and may only be released in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See id.* §§ 773.091-.094. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of EMS records subject to chapter 773. Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov’t Code § 552.107(1)*. 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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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).

You state the responsive information you have indicated consists of communications involving city attorneys, employees, and officials. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were confidential, and you do not indicate the city has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to most of the information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the responsive information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to parties you have not demonstrated are privileged. Furthermore, if these e-mails are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Further, upon review, we find the remaining responsive information at issue was sent to or received from parties you have not demonstrated are privileged. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information you have indicated under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(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; [or]

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

...

(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; [or]

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1)-(2), (b)(1)-(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A)* (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the information you have indicated pertains to an incident. However, you state you “were not able to confirm with the [city’s police department] the status of the case involved.” Accordingly you claim the information at issue may be subject to section 552.108(a)(1), 552.108(b)(1), 552.108(a)(2), or 552.108(b)(2). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue relates to pending criminal investigations or prosecutions, nor have you explained how the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, the you have not met your burden under section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1). Furthermore, you have not demonstrated the information at issue relates to concluded criminal cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, you have not met your burden under section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2). Consequently, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.108 of the Government Code. *See id.*

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” *See id.* § 552.111. This section 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 consisting 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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).

You argue the deliberative process privilege is applicable to the information you have indicated. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on a policy making matter of the city. Accordingly, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.111 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* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is applicable to 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) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and 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 be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official 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. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality

pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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. However, section 552.130 is designed to protect the privacy of individuals, and because "the right of privacy is purely personal," that right "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]" *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) ("action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded" (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) ("the right of privacy lapses upon death"), H-917 (1976) ("We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death."); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) ("the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death"). Upon review, we find the motor vehicle record information at issue relates solely to a deceased individual. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the responsive information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the city maintains the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail

addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure. 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.

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](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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/sdk

Ref: ID# 648650

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)