



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 17, 2022

Mr. Jeffrey L. Moore
Counsel for the City of Roanoke
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2022-07901

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 936565.

The Roanoke Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for salary information and disciplinary files for certain employees from particular time periods, as well as a copy of the department's general orders. We understand the department will release some information upon payment of costs. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, you state some of the requested information was the subject of previous requests for rulings, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2015-23687 (2015) and 2019-23546 (2019). In Open Records Letter No. 2015-23687, we determined the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code and must release the remaining information. In Open Records Letter No. 2019-23546, we determined the department 1) may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-23687 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling, 2) may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code, and 3) must release the remaining

¹ We assume that 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.

information. We have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Thus, the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2015-23687 and 2019-23546 as previous determinations and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

Next, we note Exhibit C is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibit C is part of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The department must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The department seeks to withhold portions of Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 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), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider the department's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Further, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information at issue.

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides:

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 not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the information you marked in Exhibit C consists of communications between outside counsel for the department and department employees and officials. You also state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You assert the information at issue was intended to be confidential and confidentiality has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the department has established the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the department may withhold the information you marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n 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 . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code

§ 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). Rather than merely making a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement, the governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Record Decision No. 252 (1980) (section 552.108 designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment). However, section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

Exhibit D consists of a portion of the department’s policy manual. You state release of the information you marked would provide individuals with “an advantage in confrontations with [c]ity police officers and would increase [their] chances of evading arrest.” You further state release of the information at issue “could endanger the lives and safety of police officers.” Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated release of the information at issue, which you marked, would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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 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).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public’s interest was

sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held “the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released.” *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure.

The remaining information in Exhibit C relates to an investigation into an alleged incident of sexual harassment. Thus, we find the information is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, we determine the information at issue does not contain an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, the information at issue must generally be released. However, the information that identifies the victim and witnesses must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Accordingly, we conclude the department must withhold the types of information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

Additionally, we note some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2015-23687 and 2019-23546 as previous determinations and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with those rulings. The department may withhold the information you marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the types of information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department 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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/be

Ref: ID# 936565

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)