



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 20, 2017

Ms. Julie Allen
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
P.O. Box 13127
Austin, Texas 78711-3127

OR2017-05638

Dear Ms. Allen:

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# 650307 (TABC Ref. ID No. 1482859916).

The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (the "commission") received a request for all personnel records of a named commission police officer. You state the commission will release some information to the requestor. You state the commission will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.152 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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). Portions of Exhibit C-6 consist of completed evaluations and investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The commission must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 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 information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, 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). Accordingly, we will consider your claims of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information at issue. Furthermore, we will consider your arguments for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 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).

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. 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. 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 Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You state the information in Exhibit C-6 subject to section 552.022 was communicated between commission attorneys and commission employees and officials. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have established the information at issue constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the commission may withhold the information in Exhibit C-6 subject to section 552.022 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for the information in Exhibit C-6 not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, along with the information in Exhibit C-7. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those for rule 503 discussed above. 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. *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 attorneys, officials, and staff of the commission. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the commission may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C-6, along with the information in Exhibit C-7, under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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 . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded that section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You explain the information in Exhibit C-8 pertains to undercover operations conducted by the commission’s Law Enforcement Division to detect and investigate criminal conduct under the commission’s enforcement authority. You state these records are not shared publicly, or even to non-enforcement departments of the agency. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated release of Exhibit C-8 would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the commission may withhold Exhibit C-8 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³

³As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”). *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a “fitness for duty examination” conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find the ADA is not applicable to any of the information at issue. Thus, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code, which governs the public availability of information submitted to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (“TCOLE”) under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.454 provides as follows:

(a) All information submitted to [TCOLE] under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.

(b) Except as provided by this subchapter, a [TCOLE] member or other person may not release information submitted under this subchapter.

Occ. Code § 1701.454. We understand you to assert some of the submitted information is subject to section 1701.454. However, we note section 1701.454 is applicable only to information submitted to TCOLE under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. *See id.* § 1701.454(a). The only report or statement found in subchapter J is form F-5, which you have not submitted. *See id.* § 1701.452. Therefore, we conclude section 1701.454 is not applicable to any of the remaining information and the commission may not it under section 552.101 on that basis. *See Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996)* (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection).

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the commission must withhold all employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987)*. 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. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d 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*, 354 S.W.3d 336. *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.⁵ *Tex. 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

⁴The 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)*.

⁵Section 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).

common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the commission must withhold the information we have marked, along with the public citizen's date of birth, in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Upon review, we find the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides,

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Id. § 552.152. You state portions of the remaining information includes names and identifying information of undercover commission law enforcement agents. You state release of information related to these agents “would negatively impact their ability to investigate and detect crime . . . , take precautions related to their personal safety when engaged in undercover operations, undermine their ability to maintain confidential cover, and protect other elements of anonymity that, if lost, [would] subject them to a substantial threat of physical harm.” Upon review, we find release of the remaining information identifying commission employees engaged in undercover operations would subject these employees to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, to the extent the remaining information consists of the name or identifying information of employees of the commission engaged in undercover operations, the commission must withhold this information under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission may withhold: (1) the information in Exhibit C-6 subject to section 552.022 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503; (2) the remaining information in Exhibit C-6, along with the information in Exhibit C-7, under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; and (3) Exhibit C-8 under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The commission must withhold: (1) all employees' dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code; (2) the information we have marked, along with the public citizen's date of birth, in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in

conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; and (4) any remaining information which consists of the name or identifying information of employees of the commission engaged in undercover operations under section 552.152 of the Government Code. The commission must release the remaining information.⁶

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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/sdk

Ref: ID# 650307

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁶We note the remaining information includes a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a government body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).