



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 15, 2019

Ms. Brandy Kidwell  
Records Division Manager  
North Richland Hills Police Department  
P.O. Box 820609  
North Richland Hills, Texas 76182-0609

OR2019-01172

Dear Ms. Kidwell:

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# 746663 (Ref. No. 18-1027).

The North Richland Hills Police Department (the "department") received a request for specified information pertaining to immigration enforcement during a specified period of time. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.109, 552.111, 552.1175, 552.137, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we must address the department'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. Section 552.301(b) requires that a governmental body ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the

---

<sup>1</sup>This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested information to the extent that the other information is substantially different than that submitted to this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Section 552.301(e) requires the governmental body to submit to the attorney general, not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of the receipt of the request: (1) written comments stating why the governmental body's claimed exceptions apply to the information that it seeks to withhold; (2) a copy of the written request for information; (3) a signed statement of the date on which the governmental body received the request or evidence sufficient to establish that date; and (4) the specific information that the governmental body seeks to withhold or representative samples if the information is voluminous. *Id.* § 552.301(e)(1).

You state the department received the request for information on September 11, 2018. Because you do not inform this office the department was closed for business any of the days at issue, we find the department's ten- and fifteen-business-day deadlines were September 25, 2018, and October 2, 2018, respectively. However, the envelope in which the department provided the information required by sections 552.301(b) and section 552.301(e) was meter-marked November 2, 2018. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Thus, the department failed to comply with the requirements mandated by 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 department claims sections 552.101, 552.107(1), 552.109, 552.111, 552.1175, 552.137, and 552.152 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.101, 552.107(1), 552.109, 552.1175, 552.137, and 552.152 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your arguments under these sections for the submitted information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of

Federal Regulations,<sup>2</sup> which protects information regarding detainees held on behalf of the Department of Homeland Security (the “DHS”).<sup>3</sup> This section provides as follows:

No person, including any state or local government entity or any privately operated detention facility, that houses, maintains, provides services to, or otherwise holds any detainee on behalf of the Service (whether by contract or otherwise), and no other person who by virtue of any official or contractual relationship with such person obtains information relating to any detainee, shall disclose or otherwise permit to be made public the name of, or other information relating to, such detainee. Such information shall be under the control of the Service and shall be subject to public disclosure only pursuant to the provisions of applicable federal laws, regulations and executive orders. Insofar as any documents or other records contain such information, such documents shall not be public records. This section applies to all persons and information identified or described in it, regardless of when such persons obtained such information, and applies to all requests for public disclosure of such information, including requests that are the subject of proceedings pending as of April 17, 2002.

8 C.F.R. § 236.6; *see also id.* § 1.2 (defining Service as “U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and/or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as appropriate in the context in which the term appears”). The department argues Exhibit F pertains to detainees for purposes of section 236.6. Based on our review, we find the department is required to abide by rules promulgated by the DHS with regard to the detainees. *See id.* § 2.1 (providing Secretary of Homeland Security may issue regulations to administer and enforce laws relating to immigration and naturalization of aliens); *see also ACLU of N.J., Inc. v. County of Hudson*, 799 A.2d 629 (N.J. 2002) (stating while state possesses sovereign authority over operation of its jails, it may not operate them, in respect to INS detainees, in any way that derogates federal government’s exclusive and expressed interest in regulating aliens). The department does not provide our office with any applicable federal law, regulation, or executive order that provides the requestor with a right of access to the information at issue. We therefore conclude Exhibit F is made confidential by section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations and must be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code (providing that the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish regulations necessary to carry out laws relating to immigration and naturalization)

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.101 encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. A federal statute or an administrative regulation enacted pursuant to statutory authority can provide statutory confidentiality for purposes of section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 476 (1987) (addressing statutory predecessor).

<sup>3</sup>We note the functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (“INS”) were transferred to DHS on March 1, 2003. *See* Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002).

and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See ACLU*, 799 A.2d at 655 (concluding that because INS had authority to promulgate 8 C.F.R. § 236.6, provision preempts state law requiring disclosure of requested information); *see also English v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting that state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting that federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation).

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). 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).

The department states the information at issue consists of communications involving an attorney for the department and department employees in their capacities as clients. The department indicates these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of

professional legal services to the department and these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the department has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the department may withhold Exhibit A under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.109 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held the test to be applied to information under section 552.109 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy if it: (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person; and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See id.* 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the department has not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.109.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Section 552.1175 provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual’s choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual’s status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(1), (b). We note section 552.1175 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). The cellular telephone number we have marked relates to a peace officer who is employed by another law enforcement agency. Accordingly, the department must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked if the individual at issue elected to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. However, you have not demonstrated how section 552.1175 applies to any of the remaining information. As such, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information on this basis.

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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address we have marked are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the department must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. However, the remaining information either does not consist of e-mail addresses or consists of e-mail addresses that are specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See id.* Thus, the department may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.137.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 [of the Government Code] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. Upon review, we find the department has not demonstrated the release of any of the remaining information would subject an employee of the department to a substantial threat of physical harm. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibit F section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code. The department may withhold Exhibit A under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked if the individual at issue elected to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b)

of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The department must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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](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 'Michelle Garza', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Michelle Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MG/mo

Ref: ID# 746663

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)