



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 5, 2019

Ms. Katie Leininger
Assistant City Attorney
City of Pearland
3519 Liberty Drive
Pearland, Texas 77581

OR2019-34251

Dear Ms. Leininger:

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# 799998.

The City of Pearland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a named city councilmember and a named individual. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, you argue some of the submitted information is not "public information" subject to disclosure under the Act. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public

¹ Although you raise section 552.024 of the Government Code, we note this section is not an exception to disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024 (permitting current and former officials and employees of a governmental body to choose whether to allow public access to certain information relating to them that is held by the employing governmental body). However, we understand you to raise section 552.117 of the Government Code based on the substance of your arguments.

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 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.

information” as information 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.

Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess. Information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party, including an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in his or her official capacity, may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns, has a right of access, or spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides that it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

You assert the information submitted as Exhibit F “*is not* ‘public information’ as defined by [section] 552.002(a) [of the Government Code.]” However, we find the information was collected, assembled, or maintained in connection with the transaction of the city’s official business. Therefore, we conclude the information at issue is subject to the Act and the city must release it unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See id.* §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

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. 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 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.*, 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).

You assert the information submitted as Exhibit C consists of privileged communications between city attorneys and city employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code.³

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

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

prosecution of crime . . . if . . . 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 the information submitted as Exhibit B pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g 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). Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. We understand the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer’s civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer’s misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer’s civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a).⁴ *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113,122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under the Act. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a police department’s internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the information submitted as Exhibit D is contained within the internal files maintained by the city’s police department pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. However, we note the information at issue consists of an e-mail maintained independently of any police officer’s personnel file. The city may not engraft

⁴ Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See* Local Gov’t Code §§ 143.051-.055.

the confidentiality afforded to records under section 143.089(g) to records that exist independently of the internal files. Therefore, the city may not withhold Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 information 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 have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone number at issue may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request

confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1). However, we find the city failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.117(a)(1) to the remaining information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city: (1) may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code; (2) may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code; and (3) must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone number at issue may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. 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,



Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/mo

Ref: ID# 799998

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)