



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 18, 2020

Ms. Montana Anderson  
Legal Assistant  
City of Abilene  
P.O. Box 60  
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2020-31830

Dear Ms. Anderson:

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# 859032 (Ref. No. 20-2044).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the search for a new police chief. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.107, 552.122, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, would "harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.104 to the information at issue. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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.*, 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 claims some of the submitted information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city states the information at issue consists of communications involving an attorney for the city and a city employee in his capacity as a client. The city states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may generally withhold the e-mails we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to the non-privileged party are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails we marked are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Additionally,

we note some of the information was sent to or received from an individual whom the city has not demonstrated to be a privileged party. Therefore, the city failed to establish the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue, which we marked for release, under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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.<sup>2</sup> 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. We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Section 552.1175 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body. See ORD 506 at 5-7. Thus, to the extent the information we marked relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular services.

Section 552.122(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] test item developed by an educational institution that is funded wholly or in part by state revenue[.]" Gov't Code § 552.122(a). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes "any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated." ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(a) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* at 7. Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of "test items" might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. See Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976). See

---

<sup>2</sup> 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).

*generally* ORD 626 at 4-5. Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when the answers might reveal the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987).

The city seeks to withhold the submitted interview questions under section 552.122 of the Government Code. However, we find the submitted questions at issue do not evaluate an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area. Rather, the information at issue reveals questions that evaluate an applicant's individual abilities, personal opinions, and subjective ability to respond to a particular situation. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.122 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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

The city seeks to withhold the identifying information of an undercover officer information under section 552.152 of the Government Code. Section 552.152 provides,

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

*Id.* § 552.152. The city informs us the information at issue identifies undercover officers. We understand the city to assert release of undercover officers' identities would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, we find section 552.152 is applicable to the identities of the undercover officers within the information at issue. Accordingly, the city must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the e-mails we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails we marked are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the information we marked relates to licensed peace officers who elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular services. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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/mo

Ref: ID# 859032

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)