



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2018

Ms. ML Calcote  
Assistant General Counsel  
Texas Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2018-04867

Dear Ms. Calcote:

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# 697689 (PIR# 17-8959).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for the license applications, licenses, and e-mail communications pertaining to the review and approval of licenses for two specified companies.<sup>1</sup> You state the department will rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2017-17632 (2017), 2017-24172 (2017), and 2017-28404 (2017) and withhold or release some of the requested information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). You claim the submitted information is

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the department 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 overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You also state you notified Compassionate Cultivation, LLC (“CC”) of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from CC. Thus, we have no basis to conclude CC has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest CC may have in the information.

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

---

<sup>2</sup>Although we understand you to raise section 552.111 based on your markings in the submitted information, you provided no arguments regarding the applicability of this section. Accordingly, we assume you no longer assert this section. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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 marked consists of communications between department attorneys and department employees and officials in their capacities as clients, as well as communications with other privileged parties. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You state these communications were confidential, and the department has not waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications the department may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the department must withhold the

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

cellular telephone numbers we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.136 provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the department must withhold the bank account, routing, and wire transfer numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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 section (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). We note section 552.137(c)(5) states section 552.137(a) does not apply to an e-mail address “provided to a governmental body for the purpose of providing public comment or receiving notices related to an application for a license as defined by Section 2001.003(2) of [the Government Code], or receiving order or decisions from a governmental body.” *Id.* § 552.137(c)(5). Accordingly, the department must withhold all personal e-mail addresses not excluded by subsection (c) under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the department must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the bank account, routing, and wire transfer numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The department must withhold all personal e-mail addresses not excluded by subsection (c) under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The department 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 "Matthew Taylor", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MHT/tdw

Ref: ID# 697689

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)