



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2017

Mr. David T. Ritter
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2017-14384

Dear Mr. Ritter:

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# 663595 (City ID #G3140).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails containing two specified names during two specified time periods.¹ You claim some of the requested information is not subject to the Act. You also claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

¹As you have not submitted a copy of the request for information, we take our description from your brief.

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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, the city argues some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to “public information,” which is defined in section 552.002 of the Government Code as:

(a) . . . information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body; or

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess. Information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party, including an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in his or her official capacity, may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns, has a right of access, or spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides that it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

The city asserts the information it has marked consists of portions of e-mails that “are wholly personal in nature, and do not involve the transaction of official city business.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 4 (1995) (recognizing that section 552.002 is not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by a public employee involving a *de minimis* use of public resources). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue does not relate to city employees or officials acting in their official capacities or the information does not pertain to official city business. Thus, the information at issue is subject to the Act and must be released unless information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Accordingly, we will address your argument against disclosure of this information.

Next, we must address the city’s obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e). You state city received the instant request on February 27, 2017, and various modifications to the request over the following weeks. However, as of the date of this letter, you have not submitted a copy of the request for information or a copy of any of the modified requests for information. Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.1175 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the city’s arguments under these sections for the submitted information. However, we find the city has failed to establish a compelling reason to address its remaining exceptions.

The city asserts the dates of birth are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Thus, 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 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to 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 “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 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 information you have marked constitutes communications between city attorneys and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You assert some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. 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. You state the information you have indicated pertains to individuals who are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. *See id.* § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure" and "federal judges and state judges as defined by Section 13.0021, Election Code[.]" *Id.* §§ 552.1175(a)(1), (13). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information you have indicated and the information we have indicated under section 552.1175 if the individuals to whom this information pertains are currently licensed peace officers, state judges, or federal judges and elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. However, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.1175 if the individuals are not currently licensed peace officers, state judges, federal judges, or no elections are made.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country. *See id.* § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have indicated and the information we have indicated under section 552.1175 if the individuals to whom this information pertains are currently licensed peace officers, state judges, or federal judges and elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/sb

Ref: ID# 663595

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)