



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 17, 2017

Ms. Jhoslyn Y. Hood
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2017-15945

Dear Ms. Hood:

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# 666304 (PIR No. W061206).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to named employees regarding specified disciplinary investigations.¹ You state you have released some of the information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files

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 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).

for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer's civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. See Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). Information maintained in a police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the information in Exhibit C1 is contained within the city police department's internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089(a) of the Local Government Code requires the civil service director to maintain a personnel file on each "police officer." Likewise, section 143.089(g) states that a police department may maintain its own personnel file on each "police officer." Both subsections refer to "police officer." Section 143.003 defines a police officer as a member of a police department or other peace officer who was appointed in substantial compliance with chapter 143 or who is entitled to civil service status under section 143.005, 143.084, or 143.103. See Loc. Gov't Code § 143.003(5) (defining "police officer" for purposes of section 143.089). You have failed to demonstrate the information at issue pertains to police officers entitled to the rights and privileges of Chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure of Exhibit C1, it must be released.

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. 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 claim Exhibit C2 is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the city, city officials, and city employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit C2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

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 found information regarding an individual’s profession or business, organizational memberships, or religious affiliation is not protected by common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision No. 674* (2001). Upon review, we find none of the information you have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Consequently, the information you seek to withhold is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit C2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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



Sidney M. Pounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SMP/sdk

Ref: ID# 666304

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)