



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 7, 2019

Ms. Lynn Trumbul
Senior Assistant City Secretary
City of Hutto
401 West Front Street
Hutto, Texas 78634

OR2019-12174

Dear Ms. Trumbil:

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# 764086 (ORR R000441).

The City of Hutto (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to improper or excessive use of force allegations made during a particular period of time, as well as analyses regarding use of force incidents. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has only submitted information pertaining to improper or excessive use of force allegations. To the extent information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Next, you note the submitted information includes an officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[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). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to a peace officer for identification in TCOLE's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officer's TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.¹

Next, we note the requestor specifically excluded all dates of birth, social security numbers, and driver's license numbers. Thus, the portions of the submitted information that consists of these types of information are not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the request.²

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). Portions of the remaining information consist of completed reports and investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed reports and investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you seek to withhold some of the information subject to section 552.022 under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Record Decision No. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. The Texas Supreme Court, however, has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 3636 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information subject to section 552.022. Further, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 for the information at issue. We will also consider the city’s arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.108(a)(2) 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 . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

only if the information at issue relates to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. However, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that are purely administrative in nature and do not involve the criminal investigation or prosecution of alleged misconduct. *See, e.g., Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 526 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982).

You state the information you marked pertains to cases that concluded in results other than convictions or deferred adjudications. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the information we have marked is subject to section 552.108(a)(2). Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.³ However, the remaining information at issue pertains to internal affairs investigations that are purely administrative in nature. As a result, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding);

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

Heard v. Houston Post Co., 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.⁴ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

Although you claim section 552.103 for some of the information not subject to section 552.022, you have not demonstrated the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request was received or was a party to any litigation which was pending on the date the request was received. *See* ORD 331. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 to the information at issue. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.103(c) (governmental body must demonstrate that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on or before the date it received request for information), .301 (e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal

⁴In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) 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 (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. See *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. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). See *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You contend some of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code contains attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 192.5.

We next address your assertion of the attorney work product privilege for the information that is not subject to section 552.022 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[.]" See Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. See *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD 677 at 4-8. As noted above, rule 192.5 defines work product and 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(a); ORD 677 at 6-8. The test for determining whether information was created or

developed in anticipation of litigation is the same as that discussed above concerning rule 192.5. *See Nat'l Tank Co.*, 851 S.W.2d at 207.

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes material prepared, impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation by or for the city. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the work-product privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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. *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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city 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 section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code, which governs the public availability of information submitted to TCOLE under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.454 provides as follows:

(a) All information submitted to [TCOLE] under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.

(b) Except as provided by this subchapter, a [TCOLE] member or other person may not release information submitted under this subchapter.

Gov't Code § 1701.454. You seek to withhold some of the submitted information under section 1701.454. However, we note section 1701.454 is applicable only to information submitted to TCOLE under subchapter J of chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. *See id.* § 1701.454(a). The only report or statement found in subchapter J is form F-5, which you have not submitted. *See id.* § 1701.452. Therefore, we conclude section 1701.454 is not applicable to any of the information and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection).

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand the city to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549–51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The Texas Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find the remaining information is not subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.


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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the responsive motor vehicle record information you marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the TCOLE number you marked is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the responsive motor vehicle record information you marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive 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 "Erin Groff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Erin" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Groff".

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 764086

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)