



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 21, 2019

Ms. Jo-Christy Brown
Counsel for the City of Lampasas
Law Offices of JC Brow, PC
1411 West Avenue, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2019-32993

Dear Ms. Ruiz:

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# 797949 (ID: RW/9.6.19).

The City of Lampasas (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails to or from four named city employees pertaining to eight keywords during a defined time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.108, and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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 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 Exhibit C consists of communications between an attorney for the city and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit C consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state Exhibit D relates to an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of Exhibit D would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

- (a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted

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

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; [and]

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). The city asserts Exhibit E relates to computer security or infrastructure. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we marked, relates to computer network security or the design, operation, or defense of a computer network. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information relates to computer network security, restricted information under section 2059.055, or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). *See id.* § 2059.055 (defining confidential network information for purposes of section 2059.055). Further, we find the city has failed to demonstrate this information consists of a computer network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139(b). Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information in Exhibit E under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)*. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We also note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code. 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. *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). Section 552.1175 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)* (section 552.117 is not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information consists of personal information of an individual who may be a licensed peace officer, which the city holds in a non-employment capacity. Accordingly, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if the individual at issue is a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 who elects to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, if the individual is not a peace officer defined by article 2.12, does not elect to restrict access to the cellular telephone number in accordance with section 552.1175(b), or the telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, then the city may not withhold this information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. If the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if the individual at issue is a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 who elects to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city 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 <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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/mo

Ref: ID# 797949

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)