



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 17, 2020

Mr. Eric Farrar  
Counsel for the City of La Marque  
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.  
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2020-20581

Dear Mr. Farrar:

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# 839234 (LaMarque20-005).

The City of La Marque (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for seventeen categories of information involving named individuals and specified dates. You state the city does not maintain information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> You state the city will withhold certain information pursuant to sections 552.136(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code, as well as e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body,” unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022, this section 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may not be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Nevertheless, 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 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to section 552.022. We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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).

You state the information at issue consists of a communication involving attorneys for the city and city employees in their capacities as clients. You state this communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state this communication was confidential, and you do not indicate the city has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Upon review, we find the city has established the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. *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). Thus, the city may withhold the information you indicated under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services [(“EMS”)] personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex,

occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(a)-(b), (g). The submitted information includes records made and maintained by EMS personnel. Upon review, we find section 773.091 is applicable to the information at issue. Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential and must be released, the city must withhold the marked EMS records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.<sup>2</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue does not consist of communications between certified emergency medical services personnel providing medical supervision and patients that were made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patients. *See id.* § 773.091(a). Furthermore, the information at issue does not consist of records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of patients by emergency medical services personnel providing medical supervision that were created by the emergency medical services personnel or maintained by an emergency medical services provider. *See id.* § 773.091(b). Accordingly, we find section 773.091 does not apply to any portion of the remaining information, and the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(16) 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 firefighter or volunteer firefighter or emergency medical services personnel as defined by Section 773.003 of the Health and Safety Code, regardless of whether the current or former employee complies with section 552.024 or 552.1175.<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(16). Section 552.117 also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(16) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> This ruling does not affect an individual's right of access to a patient's EMS records from the EMS provider. *See Health & Safety Code §§ 773.092, .093; cf. Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012, no pet.) (Medical Practice Act does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to request for information under Public Information Act).

<sup>3</sup> Although you raise section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure of this information, we note section 552.117(a)(16) is the proper exception to raise when seeking to withhold information related to a firefighter, volunteer firefighter, or emergency medical services personnel. *See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(16)*.

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 you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you indicated under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. With the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential and must be released, the city must withhold the marked EMS records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(16) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers 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,

Katie Stallcup  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AKS/be

Ref: ID# 839234

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)