



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 19, 2019

Mr. Sharbel Sfeir
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2019-07686

Dear Mr. Sfeir:

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# 755751 (OGC No. ZT0204).

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for specified e-mails sent or received by a named individual during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, 552.134, 552.136, and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made

¹We 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.

“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 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. *See 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 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 employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the department. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See*

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

Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state the information you marked pertains to sensitive department procedures at a correctional facility. In addition, you state some of the information at issue pertains to the named individual's locations and movements. You state the release of the information at issue would compromise the safety and security of the named individual and correctional facility at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the release of some of the information at issue, which we indicated, would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³ However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(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. 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, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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, 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 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). You seek to withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees and officials of the department regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁴ However, we note the remaining information at issue pertains to routine internal administrative and personnel matters. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue pertains to policymaking matters of the department for the purposes section 552.111 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.134 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

- (a) Except as provided by Subsection (b) or by Section 552.029, information obtained or maintained by the [department] is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department.

Gov't Code § 552.134(a). Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the information at issue pertains to an inmate for purposes of section 552.134. Accordingly,

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

the department may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.134 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.” *Id.* § 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.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a) (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Fam. Code § 58.008(b). The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Upon review, we find the information at issue does not involve a juvenile identified as a suspect, offender, or defendant. Therefore, we find that you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 58.008 to the information at issue, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information 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. *Industrial Found. v. Texas 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 established. *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 concluded some kinds of medical information are

generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefit programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁵ However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of an individual that is of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5, 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7. The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure;” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

our office found that “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” ORD 185. Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs which identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 428 and 430. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). However, upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former employees of the department or any division of the department, regardless of whether the current or former employee complies with section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552 .117(a)(3). We note section 552.117(a)(3) protects an employee’s personal cellular telephone provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to numbers for cellular mobile phones installed in county officials’ and employees’ private vehicles and intended for official business). Upon review, we find the information we marked is confidential pursuant to section 552.117(a)(3). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code, but may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid by a governmental body. If the cellular telephone services are paid for by a governmental body, the numbers may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted

information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

Id. § 552.139(a). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

(1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency[.]

Gov't Code § 2059.055(b). Upon review, we find the information we marked relates to computer network security, and the design, operation, or defense of the department's computer network. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. However, we find you failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information relates to computer network security, to restricted information under 2059.055, or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network as contemplated by section 552.139(a). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(3) of the Government Code, but may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid by a governmental body. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. 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 "Emily Buchanan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Emily Buchanan
Attorney
Open Records Division

EB/gw

Ref: ID# 755751

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)