



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 16, 2017

Mr. Mark C. Kratovil
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Tarrant County
401 West Belknap, 9th Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76196-0201

OR2017-23581

Dear Ms. Wilson:

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# 678235.

The Tarrant County Criminal District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for communications between employees of the 233rd District Court and a third party for a defined period of time, and communications including specified phrases for a defined period of time. We understand you will release some information to the requestor upon payment of a cost estimate. You claim a portion of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

You argue the information in Exhibit H is not subject to the Act. The Act is only applicable to "public information." *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as the following:

¹Although you raise section 552.021 of the Government Code, we note this provision is not an exception to disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.021 (providing public information is available during normal business hours). We note we asked the district attorney's office to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). We have received and considered the information submitted by the district attorney's office pursuant to that request.

[I]nformation 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;

(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).

You assert Exhibit H consists of e-mails that are not subject to the Act because they do not deal with any aspect of district attorney's office business. Upon review, we agree the emails at issue consist of personal exchanges that have no connection with the transaction of official business of the district attorney's office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Therefore, we agree Exhibit H does not constitute "information that is written, produced,

collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the district attorney’s office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.021. Thus, we conclude Exhibit H is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request.

Next, we note the submitted information contains court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of “information that is also contained in a public court record,” unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold the information at issue under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov’t Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W. 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider the assertion of attorney-client privilege by the district attorney’s office under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also consider the argument of the district attorney’s office under section 552.107 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or the client’s representative and the client’s lawyer or the lawyer’s representative;
- (B) between the client’s lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;
- (C) by the client, the client’s representative, the client’s lawyer, or the lawyer’s representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer’s representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;
- (D) between the client’s representatives or between the client and the client’s representative; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert the information at issue consist of attachments to e-mail communications between attorneys for the district attorney’s office and employees of Tarrant County (the “county”) that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the county and the county judge’s office. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of a privileged attorney-client communications. Thus, the district attorney’s office may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts from disclosure an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state the remaining information in Exhibit F consists of communications between attorneys for the district attorney’s office and county employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the county. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit F consists of privileged attorney-client communications the district attorney’s office may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government

Code.² We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails and attachments received from and sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if these e-mails and attachments received from and sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we marked, are maintained by the district attorney's office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district attorney's office may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1). In that event, we will address the district attorney's office's remaining arguments under section 552.111 of the Government Code for such information.

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 (1993), 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 that 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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).

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

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561.

The district attorney's office asserts the non-privileged e-mails and attachments in Exhibit F, to the extent they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communications, and Exhibit G consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions regarding policymaking decisions. However, upon review, the information at issue is either factual in nature or consists of internal administrative matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Additionally, we note some of the information at issue has been shared with individuals with whom the county has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest. Therefore, we find the district attorney's office has failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district attorney's office. Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

The district attorney’s office asserts the non-privileged e-mails and attachments in Exhibit F, to the extent they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communications, and Exhibit G consist of attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We note, some of the information at issue consists of information that was received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Therefore, because a non-privileged party has had access to this information, the work product privilege under section 552.111 has been waived. Upon review, we find the district attorney’s office has failed to establish the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for the district attorney’s office or representatives of the district attorney’s office. *See Nat'l Tank*, 851 S.W.2d at 206 (information created in ordinary course of business constitutes work product if agency demonstrates primary motivating purpose for preparation of information was in anticipation of litigation); *see also* ORD 677 at 7. Therefore, the district attorney’s office may not withhold any portion of the information at issue as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise and from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1304, § 13 (to be codified at Fam. Code § 58.008(b)); *see also* Fam. Code § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code); Act of May 19, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1488, § 7.002 (to be codified as amendments to Fam. Code § 51.03(b)); Act of May 30, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., H.B. 29, § 21 (to be codified as amendments to Fam. Code § 51.03(b)) (defining “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1304, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We understand the district attorney’s office to argue the information at issue is subject to section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.³ Upon review, we find the information at issue does not consist of juvenile law enforcement records subject to section 58.008. Thus, we find the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 exempts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district

³Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, we note the 85th Legislature repealed this provision effective September 1, 2017. Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1304, § 21.

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 Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district attorney's office may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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. We note section 552.117(a)(2) protects a peace officer's personal cellular telephone number only if the officer pays for the cellular telephone service with his or her personal funds. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 670 at 6 (2001) (Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure peace officer's cellular telephone number if officer pays for service), 506 at 5-6 (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the district attorney's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the district attorney's office must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies.

In summary, the district attorney's office may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district attorney's office may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we marked, are maintained by the district attorney's office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district attorney's office may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under

section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the district attorney's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The district attorney's office must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. The district attorney'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,



D. Michelle Case
Attorney
Open Records Division

DMC/eb

Ref: ID# 678235

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)