



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 4, 2020

Mr. Marc J. Schnall
Counsel for City of Hill Country Village
Langley & Banack, Incorporated
745 Easy Mulberry, Suite 700
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2020-03319

Dear Mr. Schnall:

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# 809808.

The City of Hill Country Village (the “city”), which you represent, received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to a named former employee. You state the city will release some of the requested information upon payment of costs. You claim some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.117, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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 section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

¹ 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Because the information we marked consists of files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, video tapes, or working papers used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261, the information we marked is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). You have not indicated the city’s police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the information we marked is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.²

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. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (1992) (employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from

² As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against its disclosure.

disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Whether the public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373. Generally, however, the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern). Information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and, therefore, generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performance or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). In addition, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* ORD 455.

Upon review, we find the remaining information contains information that satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, we find you failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336, 348 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth you marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to 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.

³ As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

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 state Exhibit B constitutes communications between attorneys for the city and city employees and officials that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code applies to records a governmental body holds in an employment capacity and excepts from public disclosure a peace officer’s home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. To the extent the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, then, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.⁴ Conversely, if the individual at issue is not a currently licensed peace officer, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(2). The remaining information the city has marked, which we marked for release, does not consist of a home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information and may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2).

⁴ As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

If the individual is not a currently licensed peace officer, section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code applies to the information at issue. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). 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). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee 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. You inform us the individual at issue made a timely election under section 552.024. Accordingly, if the individual is not a currently licensed peace officer, then, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁵ The remaining information the city has marked, which we marked for release, does not consist of a home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information and may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked and the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.


In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family 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 date of birth you marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the individual is not a currently licensed peace officer, then, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked and the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

⁵ As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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,



Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/gw

Ref: ID# 809808

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)