



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 11, 2020

Ms. Roxy I. Perez Stevens
Counsel for the City of Kyle
The Knight Law Firm, LLP
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2020-20008

Dear Ms. Perez Stevens:

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# 838957 (Ref. No. W006995-051920).

The City of Kyle (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for communications regarding the requestor or another named individual that relate to two specified entities. 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, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we understand you to assert some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public 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;

¹ Although you also claim the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.021 of the Government Code, we note this is not an exception to disclosure under the Act, but instead provides for the availability of public information. See Gov't Code § 552.021. Additionally, although you also raise section 552.1175 of the Government Code, we note section 552.117 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise for information held in an employment context. Moreover, although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

(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). 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). Upon review, we find the submitted information consists of information that was created and is maintained by the city for the transaction of official business. Accordingly, the submitted information is subject to the Act and must be released, unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Id. § 552.108(a)-(b). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You assert the submitted information is subject to subsections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) because it reflects the mental impressions and legal strategies of attorneys representing the state in anticipation of criminal litigation. Upon review, we agree some of the information at issue reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of attorneys representing the state. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under subsections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code.² However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(4) or 552.108(b)(3) to the remaining information at issue and no portion of it may be withheld on that basis.

You generally assert the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We note section 552.108 is generally not

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

applicable to purely administrative records that 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.) (section 552.108 generally not applicable to law enforcement agency’s personnel records); *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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You do not inform us the information at issue pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(2) or 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). You have not explained the information at issue pertains to any specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(2) or 552.108(b)(2). Subsection 552.108(a)(3) is also inapplicable as the information at issue does not relate to a threat against a police officer. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.108 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.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state 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). Under section 143.089(a), the officer’s civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer’s supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(3). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. 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). *See Abbott v. 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 are in the 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 may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer’s civil service file if the police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department’s use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director’s designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter’s or police officer’s personnel file.

Id. In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer’s personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(g) to “information reasonably related to a police officer’s or fire fighter’s employment relationship”); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You assert the remaining information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. We note section 143.021(b) of the Local Government Code provides that “[e]xcept for the department head and a person the department head appoints in accordance with Section 143.014 or 143.102, each fire fighter and police officer is classified as prescribed by this subchapter and has civil service protection.” Local Gov’t Code § 143.021(b) (emphasis added). Section 143.003 of the Local Government Code defines “department head” as “the chief or head of a fire or police department or that person’s equivalent, regardless of the name or title used.” *Id.* § 143.003(2). Thus, information maintained by the city’s police department pertaining to the department head as defined by section 143.003 and a person the department head appoints in accordance with section 143.014 or section 143.102 is not confidential under section 143.089(g) of the

Local Government Code. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue is confidential under section 143.089(g). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

We understand you to assert the remaining information consists of communications involving privileged parties. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes communications between privileged parties made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city for the purposes of section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.107 of the 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. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). This office has also held common-law privacy protects the identifying information of a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. However, 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 (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 find some of the information at issue 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 552.101 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 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information 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 portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

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. As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. 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 no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home addresses, home telephone numbers, 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 section 552.024 or section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). It is unclear whether the city employee at issue is a currently licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) pertains to an employee that is a currently licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee is not a currently licensed peace officer, then the information at issue may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, no portion of the remaining information consists of a home address or telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, or family member information pertaining to a current or former city employee and may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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 *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 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. Accordingly, to the extent the individual 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. Conversely, to the extent the individual 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). As noted above, no portion of the remaining information at issue consists of a home address or telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, or family member information pertaining to a current or former city employee. Therefore, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”³ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides, “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act],” unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or a personal e-mail address belonging to a city employee or official used to conduct official government business. *See id.* § 552.137(c); *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). We note the requestor has a right of access to his personal e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b). Accordingly, with the exception of the requestor’s e-mail address, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information belong to members of the public and are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See id.* However, to the extent an e-mail address within the remaining information is excluded by subsection 552.137(c) or belongs to a government employee or official, the city may not withhold that e-mail address under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under subsections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) 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. To the extent the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) pertains to an employee that is a currently licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the city must withhold this information

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue is not a currently licensed peace officer but 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. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. With the exception of the requestor's e-mail address, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information belong to members of the public and are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold information subject to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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/rm

Ref: ID# 838957

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)