



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 6, 2020

Ms. ML Calcote
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2020-00320

Dear Ms. Calcote:

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# 804391 (PIR # 19-4458).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for all records pertaining to a particular meeting of the Public Safety Commission (the "commission"). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 other statutes make confidential. Section 551.104 of the Government Code provides, in part, "[t]he certified agenda or recording of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)." *Id.* § 551.104(c). Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-995 at 5-6 (1988) (public disclosure of certified agenda of closed meeting may be accomplished only under procedures provided in Open Meetings Act). Section 551.146 of the Open Meetings Act makes it a criminal offense to disclose a certified agenda or recording of a lawfully closed meeting to a member of the public. *See* Gov't Code § 551.146(a)-(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1988) (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether governmental body may withhold such information under

statutory predecessor to section 552.101). However, other records related to a closed meeting, other than a certified agenda or recording, are not made confidential by chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2-3 (1992) (concluding that section 551.074 does not authorize a governmental body to withhold its records of the names of applicants for public employment who were discussed in an executive session), 485 at 9-10 (1987) (investigative report not excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101 simply by virtue of its having been considered in executive session); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JM-1071 at 3 (1989) (statutory predecessor to section 551.146 did not prohibit members of governmental body or other individuals in attendance at executive session from making public statements about subject matter of executive session); Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making certain information confidential or stating that information shall not be released to public).

You assert the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of a report presented in an executive session of the commission. We note the submitted information does not constitute a certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting. Therefore, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

Next, we note some of the submitted 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The department must release the completed report pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The department seeks to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address the department’s claim of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client’s representative and the client’s lawyer or the lawyer’s representative;

(B) between the client’s lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;

(C) by the client, the client’s representative, the client’s lawyer, or the lawyer’s representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer’s representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client’s representatives or between the client and the client’s representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

The department states the information you marked was prepared by a department attorney and was communicated to department employees and officials in their capacities as clients.

The department states the information was communicated in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the department. The department states the information was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the department has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you marked. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney’s entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the department may withhold the information you marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Section 552.108(a) 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). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to administrative records that are purely administrative in nature and do not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. 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). However, you state this information is related to a criminal investigation and release of that information would interfere with the investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the remaining information 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information. Therefore, you may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 804391

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)