



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 10, 2022

Mr. Ariel San Miguel
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2022-07263

Dear Mr. San Miguel:

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# 934212 (Reference No. S000214).

The Houston Airport System (the "system") received a request for all e-mails pertaining to the requestor during a stated time period.¹ You state the system will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made

¹ You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the system sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

confidential by other statutes, such as section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in pertinent part, the following:

(a) Reports, records, and information received from any source, including from a federal agency or from another state, furnished to a public health district, a health authority, a local health department, or the [Texas Department of State Health Services] that relate to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are confidential and may be used only for the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Reports, records, and information relating to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are not public information under [the Act], and may not be released or made public on subpoena or otherwise except as provided by:

(1) Subsections (c), (d), and (f); and

(2) Section 181.060 [of the Health and Safety Code].

Health & Safety Code § 81.046(a)-(b). In Open Records Decision No. 577 (1990), this office concluded any information acquired or created during an investigation under chapter 81 of the Health and Safety Code is confidential and may not be released unless an exception set out in the statute applies. *See* ORD 577; *see also* Health & Safety Code § 81.046(b)-(d), (f). You assert the information in Exhibit 2 is confidential under section 81.046. However, upon review, we find you have failed to establish any portion of the information in Exhibit 2 is confidential under section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code, and the system may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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. *See 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 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).

You state Exhibit 3 consists of communications between attorneys for the system and system employees in their capacity as clients. You also state these communications were made for the purpose of providing professional legal services to the system. You further state these communications have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties and have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the system may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, information pertaining to leave of public employees is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 at 2 (1982) (names of employees taking sick leave and dates of sick leave taken not private). Additionally, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We note the requestor has a right of access to his personal information, and this information may not be withheld from him under common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are 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

individuals request information concerning themselves). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the system must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we conclude the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the system may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

In summary, the system may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The system must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The system must release the remaining information to this requestor.³

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 M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/mo

Ref: ID# 934212

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ We note the information being released contains information to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); *see also* ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the system receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the system must again seek a ruling from this office.