



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 11, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2019-18840

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 774794 (OGC# 190123).

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (the "university") received a request for information pertaining a named individual's salary and specified work performed by the individual. The university will release some information to the requestor. The university claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the university claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 information made confidential by statutes, such as section 258.102(a) of the Occupations Code, which reads as follows:

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.

The following information is privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter:

- (1) a communication between a dentist and a patient that relates to a professional service provided by the dentist; and
- (2) a dental record.

Occ. Code § 258.102(a). A “dental record” means dental information about a patient that is created or maintained by a dentist and relates to the history or treatment of the patient. *See id.* § 258.101(1). Upon review, we find the university must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 258.102(a) of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations,² which protects information regarding detainees held on behalf of the United States Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”).³ 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.

²A 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).

³We 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).

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”). We note some of the remaining information pertains to detainees for purposes of section 236.6. We understand the university is required to abide by rules promulgated by DHS with regard to detainees. *See id.* § 2.1 (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) (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 university does not provide our office with any applicable law, regulation, or executive order that provides the requestor with a right of access to the information at issue. We therefore conclude the information at issue is made confidential by section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code (providing the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish regulations necessary to carry out laws relating to immigration and naturalization) and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations.⁴ *See ACLU*, 799 A.2d at 655 (concluding 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 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 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

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

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). 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 university states the information it marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the university and university employees in their capacities as clients. The university states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the university. The university states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the university has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 258.102(a) of the Occupations Code. The university must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The university may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university 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,



Lecelle Clarke
Attorney
Open Records Division

LC/gw

Ref: ID# 774794

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)