



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 30, 2019

Mr. Thomas L. McMillian
Assistant City Attorney
City of Amarillo
200 Southeast 3rd Avenue, 4th Floor
Amarillo, Texas 79101-1514

OR2019-30610

Dear Mr. McMillian:

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# 793951 (ORR# 19-1725).

The City of Amarillo (the "city") received a request for five categories of information pertaining to Ring, LLC ("Ring").¹ The city claims some of the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.117 of the Government Code. Additionally, the city states release of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of Ring. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Ring of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office. *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 claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of a representative sample.²

¹ The city states, and provides documentation demonstrating, the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S. W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² We 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

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the date the city received the instant request for information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Ring explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Ring has a protected proprietary interest in the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.110; 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, 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. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Ring 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. *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 "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). 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*

letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

communication, *id.*, 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 claim the information you marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code consists of communications between a city attorney and city employees in their capacity as clients. You state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find most of the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note the information we marked for release consists of a communication provided by the city to a third party regarding contract negotiations. Thus, the parties’ interests were adverse at the time of the communication. Therefore, we conclude the city failed to establish the information we marked for release constitutes a privileged communication for the purposes of section 552.107(1), and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). You inform us the information you marked relates to closed criminal cases that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based upon your representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.³

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. *See id.* § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex.

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

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, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that subsection 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. See Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). 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., ORDs 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 marked information under section 552.108(b)(1). However, upon review, we find you failed to demonstrate the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution efforts. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 find some of the remaining responsive information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you failed to demonstrate any of the remaining responsive information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, none of the remaining responsive information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential.⁴ *See* Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Upon review, we find some of the remaining responsive information includes personal information of individuals who may be licensed peace officers, which the city holds in a non-employment capacity. Accordingly, to the extent the information we indicated relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. However, if the individuals at issue are not currently licensed peace officers or do not elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the indicated information may not be withheld under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold all visible license plates in the remaining responsive information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining responsive information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if the individuals are licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all visible license plates in the remaining responsive information under section 552.130 of the

⁴ 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 Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 793951

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)