



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 16, 2022

Ms. Leigh Ann Tognetti  
Assistant District Attorney  
Hidalgo County  
100 East Cano Street  
Edinburg, Texas 78539

OR2022-28461

Dear Ms. Tognetti:

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# 972481 (Ref. Nos. 2022-125-DA.SO & 2022-125-DA).

The Hidalgo County Sheriff's Office and the Hidalgo County District Attorney's Office (collectively, the "county") each received a request for certain communications with United States Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") during a stated time period. The county states it will release some of the requested information. The county claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code. Additionally, the county states release of the submitted information may implicate the interests of CBP. Accordingly, the county states, and provides documentation showing, it notified CBP of the requests for information and of the right to submit comments to this office why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from CBP. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

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.*

---

<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.

§ 552.101. CBP asserts the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the federal Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), chapter 552 of the United States Code. We note FOIA is applicable to information held by an agency of the federal government. In this instance, the information at issue is held by the county, which is subject to the laws of the State of Texas. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979) (FOIA exceptions apply to federal agencies, not to state agencies); Open Records Decision Nos. 496 (1988), 124 (1976); *see also Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1980) (state governments are not subject to FOIA); Open Records Decision No. 561 at 7 n.3 (1990) (noting federal authorities may apply confidentiality principles found in FOIA differently from way in which such principles are applied under Texas open records law). This office has stated in numerous opinions that information in the possession of a governmental body of the State of Texas is not confidential or excepted from disclosure merely because the same information is or would be confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *See, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion MW-95; ORD 124 (fact that information held by federal agency is excepted by FOIA does not necessarily mean that same information is excepted under Act when held by Texas governmental body). Therefore, the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of FOIA.

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 county states Exhibit C consists of a communication involving attorneys for the county and county employees and officials in their capacities as clients. The county states the communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. The county states the communication was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the county has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the county may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) 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." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). 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 Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (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). Upon review, we find the county has failed to demonstrate release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) 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.<sup>2</sup> Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “criminal investigators of the United States as described by article 2.122(a) Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(7). 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. 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). Accordingly, to the extent the information we have marked pertains to an individual who is subject to section 552.1175(a) of the Government Code and who elects to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, the county must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code as long as the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, if the individual is not subject to section 552.1175(a) of the Government Code or does not elect to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the county may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the information we have marked pertains to an individual who is subject to section 552.1175(a) of the Government Code and who elects to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, the county must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code as long as the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The county 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,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/jm

---

<sup>2</sup> 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).

Ref: ID# 972481

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Interested Party  
(w/o enclosures)