



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 10, 2020

Ms. Katie Leininger
Assistant City Attorney
City of Pearland
3519 Liberty Drive
Pearland, Texas 77581

OR2020-30974

Dear Ms. Leininger:

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# 857038.

The City of Pearland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the city's issuance of a specified order. The city claims the submitted information is either not subject to the Act or excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

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. 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. 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.* 503(b)(1), 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).

The city explains Exhibit B consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The city also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.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 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *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 some of the submitted information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other argument of the city to withhold this information.

of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

The city asserts the remaining information is not subject to the Act pursuant to section 552.002(d) of the Government Code, which provides, as follows:

“Protected health information” as defined by Section 181.006, Health and Safety Code, is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

Gov’t Code § 552.002(d). Section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

[F]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual’s protected health information:

(1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity[.]

Health & Safety Code § 181.006(1). Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines “covered entity,” in part, as any person who:

for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

Id. § 181.001(b)(2)(A). Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code to the remaining information. Accordingly, we find the remaining information is subject the Act, and the city must release it, unless it falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302. However, we note the city does not raise any additional arguments to withhold any of the remaining information.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/gw

Ref: ID# 857038

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)