



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 31, 2022

Mr. Michael L. Martin
Attorney for the City of Krugerville
Brown & Hofmeister, LLP
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2022-09569

Dear Mr. Martin:

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# 939479.

The City of Krugerville (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for four categories of information pertaining to a named individual during specified time periods.¹ You state you will release some information to the requestor. We understand you will redact a social security number under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.109, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code.³ We have considered

¹ You state the city sought and received clarification of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² 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 Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

³ Although you mark some information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. Further,

the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴ We have also received and considered comments submitted on behalf of the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

You argue some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is only applicable to "public information." *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). You explain the information you have marked contains purely personal text messages and e-mails that have no connection with the transaction of official business of the city. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Upon review, we find the information we have marked does not constitute "information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business" by or for the system. *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. Thus, we conclude the information we have marked is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request.⁵ We note, however, the remaining information at issue consists of information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by the city for the transaction of official business. Thus, the remaining information at issue is

⁴ 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.

⁵ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

subject to the Act and must be released, unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 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). However, we note some of the information at issue pertains to individuals who are or will be de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected. Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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. *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 the information you have marked consists of communications between city attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to most of the information at issue. Thus, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes communications between privileged parties made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city for the purposes of section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Thus, the city may not withhold the information we have marked for release on the basis section 552.107(1).

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 current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the current or honorably retired peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2); *id.* § 552.003(1-b) (defining “honorably retired” for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(c) (providing that “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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.⁶ 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* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, to the extent the information we have marked relates to a licensed peace officer who elects to restrict access to his information in

⁶ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone number may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular service. If the individual whose information is at issue is not currently a licensed peace officer or does not elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130. Therefore, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.130. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue consists of a credit card, debit card, or charge card number, or is an access device number used to obtain money, goods, services, or any item of value, or used to initiate the transfer of funds. *See id.* §§ 552.136(a), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.136 of the Government Code to the remaining information at issue, and the city may not withhold it on this ground.

In summary, the information we have marked is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the information we have marked relates to a current or honorably retired peace officer who elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), it must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone number may only be withheld under section 552.1175 if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/be

Ref: ID# 939479

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)