



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 7, 2017

Ms. Elizabeth Lutton
Legal Advisor
Dallas County Sheriff's Department
133 North Riverfront Boulevard, LB-31
Dallas, Texas 75207

OR2017-12521

Dear Ms. Lutton:

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# 660946.

The Dallas County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for all information pertaining to internal affairs investigations pertaining to a named officer, including a specified internal affairs investigation.¹ You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the sheriff's office has only submitted the requested e-mails pertaining to the specified internal investigation. To the extent any other information responsive to this

¹We note the sheriff's office 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 that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

request existed on the date the sheriff's office received the request, we assume the sheriff's office has released it. If the sheriff's office has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.103 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 sheriff's office has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas 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.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The sheriff's office must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that 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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* 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 that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for

information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. However, upon review, we find the sheriff's office has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when the sheriff's office received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the sheriff's office has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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 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, 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 submitted information consists of communications between a sheriff's office employee and attorneys with the Dallas County District Attorney's Office. You state the communications were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the sheriff's office. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the sheriff's office has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Therefore, the sheriff's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.² However, the remaining information at issue was sent to individuals you have not identified and we are not able to discern are privileged parties. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(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) the release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). Subsection 552.108(a)(1) protects information if its release would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Subsection 552.108(b)(1) protects internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that if released would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). A governmental body claiming subsections 552.108(a)(1) and 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). However, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the criminal investigation or prosecution of alleged misconduct. See, e.g., *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 526 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); see also *Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d at 329 (section 552.108 generally not applicable to law enforcement agency's personnel records); Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). The remaining information pertains to an internal administrative investigation of a sheriff's office deputy. You have not demonstrated the information is related to any pending criminal investigation or prosecution, and do not otherwise establish release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsections 552.108(a)(1) and 552.108(b)(1) to the remaining information. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under subsection 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception 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 that consist 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 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 state the remaining information is subject to section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the remaining information is general administrative and purely factual information or has been shared with an individual with whom the sheriff's office has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest. Thus, we find the sheriff's office has failed to show the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the sheriff's office. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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. We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (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). Upon review, we find the sheriff's office must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.

In summary, the sheriff's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The sheriff's office 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SMP', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Sidney M. Pounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SMP/nmd

Ref: ID# 660946

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)