



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2022

Mr. Daniel Sylvia
Counsel for the City of Dayton
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
1517 Trinity Street
Liberty, Texas 77575-4628

OR2022-18606

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

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# 956220.

The City of Dayton (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for (1) all information pertaining to a named individual during a defined period of time and (2) information pertaining to specified accusations or complaints against a named individual during a defined period of time. You claim 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 information.

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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public

records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present requests, in part, requires the city to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. We find these requests for unspecified law enforcement records implicate the named individual's right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not part of a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note you have submitted information that does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. This information does not constitute part of a criminal history compilation of the named individual and may not be withheld on that basis. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of other exceptions to disclosure of this information.

We note some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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 consists of a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city 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 city seeks to withhold 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 city may not withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, 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). Accordingly, we will address the city's claim of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022. In addition, as section 552.101 of the Government Code can make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will also address its applicability to the information at issue.

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

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

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document 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).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022 was prepared by outside counsel for the city and was communicated to city officials in their capacities as clients. You state the information at issue was communicated in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state the information at issue was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit C. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25

S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney’s entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purposes of providing legal service and advice). Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit C pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹

In summary, to the extent the city maintains unspecified law enforcement records depicting the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the city must withhold any such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold Exhibit C pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/jxd

Ref: ID# 956220

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.