



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 12, 2017

Mr. Byron L. Brown
Counsel for the City of Fulshear
Randle Law Office, Ltd., L.L.P.
820 Gessner, Suite 1570
Houston, Texas 77024-4494

OR2017-10215

Dear Mr. 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# 657654.

The City of Fulshear (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for all communications between two named individuals to or from city staff, the mayor, and city council members during a specified time period.¹ You state you will provide some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is either not responsive or excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state some of the submitted information is non-responsive to the present requests because it was created after the date the city received the first request. However, we note the information at issue was created before the city received the second request.

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

Therefore, we find the information at issue is responsive to the second request, and we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we note you have redacted portions of the submitted information. We understand the city has redacted e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² However, we note you have redacted additional portions of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city has been authorized to withhold the remaining redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). As such, this information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure.

In this instance, we can discern the nature of some of the redacted information. Thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling, and we will address whether this information is subject to disclosure under the Act. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with the requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacting information be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested"). However, we are unable to discern the nature of the remaining redacted information. Therefore, the city has failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code as to this information, and this information is presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must release the remaining redacted information.

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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. *See 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 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 information you marked under section 552.107 consists of communications between the city attorney and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990)

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

(personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid by a governmental body, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone number under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the

⁴The 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining 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, 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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/bw

Ref: ID# 657654

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)