



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 11, 2017

Ms. Halfreda Anderson-Nelson  
Senior Assistant General Counsel  
Dallas Area Rapid Transit  
P.O. Box 660163  
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2017-18254

Dear Ms. Anderson-Nelson:

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# 670375 (DART ORR# W001697-052417).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for all internal affairs investigations involving a named DART police officer. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 452.061 of the Transportation Code. DART is a regional transportation authority governed by chapter 452 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code ch. 452; *see also id.* § 452.001(1) (defining "authority" for purposes of chapter 452 of the Transportation Code). Section 452.061 of the Transportation Code provides in relevant part:

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

(e) Personal identifying information collected by an authority is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, including a person's:

- (1) name, address, e-mail address, and phone number;
- (2) account number, password, payment transaction activity, toll or charge record, or credit, debit, or other payment card number; and
- (3) other personal financial information.

*Id.* § 452.061(e). You assert the information you have indicated contains personal identifying information made confidential by section 452.061(e). We note subsection 452.061(e) is contained in section 452.061, which is titled “Fares and Other Charges.” Additionally, subsections (a) through (d) of section 452.061 discuss an authority’s responsibilities in imposing fares and other charges and the state’s power to regulate taxes imposed by an authority or other compensation authorized by this section. *See id.* § 452.061(a)–(d). Accordingly, we conclude section 452.061(e) is only applicable to personal identifying information collected by DART for purposes relating to the collection of fares and other charges. *Cf. Paxton v. Tex. Dep’t of State Health Servs.*, 500 S.W.3d 702, 706 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding although isolated reading of section 531.1021(g) of Government Code suggests it applies to any Office of Inspector General (“OIG”) investigation, confidentiality of OIG investigations provided by section 531.1021(g) must be read in context of OIG’s enabling provisions and thus, extended only to OIG investigations concerning fraud, waste, and abuse in the provision and delivery of health and human services in the state). Upon review, we find DART did not collect the personal identifying information at issue for purposes relating to the collection of fares and other charges. Consequently, the personal identifying information at issue is not confidential under section 452.061(e) of the Transportation Code, and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.107(1). 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 indicated consists of communications involving DART attorneys and DART employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to DART. You state these communications were intended to be, and 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. Accordingly, DART may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You provide a representation stating the information you have indicated relates to pending criminal prosecutions, and release of this information would interfere with these prosecutions. Based on these representations, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, we note, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, DART may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.108(a)(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. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception 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, opinions, recommendations, 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). However, 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). Upon review, we find the information you have indicated relates to a routine personnel matter. You have not demonstrated how this information relates to administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect DART's policy mission. Accordingly, DART may not withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.111 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. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of

which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Further, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.).

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the submitted information must be withheld in its entirety to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, the request for information reveals that the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of the information you have indicated. Therefore, withholding only the individual's identity or certain details of the incident from the requestor would not preserve the subject individual's common-law right of privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, DART must withhold the information you have indicated in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Furthermore, we find the additional information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, DART must withhold the additional information we have marked, along with all living public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, DART must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, DART may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the basic information,

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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 Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

which must be released, DART may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. DART must withhold: (1) the information you have indicated in its entirety; (2) the additional information we have marked; and (3) all living public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. DART must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining information.<sup>3</sup>

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](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/tdw

Ref: ID# 670375

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the information being released, including the basic information, contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).