



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 7, 2020

Mr. Darrell G-M Noga
Counsel for the City of Coppell
Brown Fox PLLC
8111 Preston Road, Suite 300
Dallas, Texas 75225

OR2020-10429

Dear Mr. Noga:

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# 820317 (Reference Nos. W005159-011320 and W005199-012420).

The City of Coppell (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for nine categories of information pertaining to a named city police officer and personnel records and investigations related to an additional five officers. You state the city will release some information. You also state the city does not maintain information responsive to portions of the first request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-10254 (2020). In that ruling, we determined the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. We have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed.

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (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).

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.

Therefore, the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-10254 as a previous determination and withhold or release the requested information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We will address your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the request for information because it was created after the date the city received the requests for information. 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 this information in response to this request.³

Next, we note the responsive information includes an officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation 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.

Id. § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to a peace

³ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

officer for identification in TCOLE's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officer's TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

We also note some of the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the 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 information at issue, which we marked, consists of completed investigations and evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code for the information at issue, these sections are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under Gov't Code § 552.111 may be waived), *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your assertion of the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Further, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the information at issue.⁴ Further, we will consider your arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” *See* Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.* 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORR 677 at 7.

You generally argue section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to the information not subject to section 552.022. Upon review, we find you have failed to establish any portion of the information at issue consists of material prepared, mental impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for the city or representatives of the city. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the information not subject to section 552.022 as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, we understand you to assert the information subject to section 552.022 constitutes attorney work product protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of trial. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

Although you claim section 552.103 for the information at issue, we find you have failed to demonstrate any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the city prior to the date the city received the instant requests for information. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 to the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.103(c) (governmental body must demonstrate that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on or before the date it received request for information), .301 (e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the responsive information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find the city must withhold all current and former employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining responsive information is subject to section 552.102(a), and the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information on that basis.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally private. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee’s 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), 455 at 9 (1987) (employment applicant’s salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 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), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees).

Upon review, we conclude some of the responsive information meets 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 no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* 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. Upon review, we find some of the remaining responsive information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(2). Accordingly, if the information at issue pertains to individuals who are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the information at issue pertains to individuals who are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. In either event, we find you failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.117(a)(2) to any of the remaining responsive information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

If the information at issue pertains to individuals who are not currently licensed peace officers, then the information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government

Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) 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 of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). 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 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. Therefore, if the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, but timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, then the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1). However, we find you failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.117(a)(1) to any of the remaining responsive information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-10254 as a previous determination and withhold or release the requested information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The officer's TCOLE identification number is not subject to the Act, and need not be released to the requestor. The city must withhold all current and former employees' dates of birth under section 552.102(a) 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. If the information at issue pertains to individuals who are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, but timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, then the city must withhold the information we

marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. The city must release the remaining responsive information.⁵

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,

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/eb

Ref: ID# 820317

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person or a person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.