



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 4, 2022

Mr. Daniel A. Trout  
Assistant County Attorney  
Potter County  
500 South Fillmore, Room 301  
Amarillo, Texas 79101

OR2022-30611

Dear Mr. Trout:

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# 972938.

The Potter County Attorney's Office and the Potter County Sheriff's Office (collectively the "county") received four requests from two different requestors for all information pertaining to the death of a named inmate. The county states it does not maintain information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the date the county received the instant requests for information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that

---

<sup>1</sup> The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup> We understand you to raise section 552.107 of the Government Code based on the substance of your arguments. Additionally, although you failed to timely raise section 552.107 of the Government Code, this provision constitutes a compelling reason to withhold information, and we will consider your argument under this exception. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301, .302.

is not responsive to the request and the county is not required to release such information in response to this request.<sup>3</sup>

Next, we note some of the responsive information may be the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2022-19823 (2022). In that ruling, we determined that the Potter County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office"): (1) must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law; (2) must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA; and (3) must release the remaining information. We have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which Open Records Letter No. 2022-19823 was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the responsive information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, the county must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2022-19823 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling.<sup>4</sup> *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 prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the information at issue is not encompassed by the previous ruling, we will consider your arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we note the responsive information includes a custodial death report. Article 49.18(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that, with the exception of any portion of the custodial death report the Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") determines is privileged, the OAG shall make the report public. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 49.18(b). Although the county claims the submitted custodial report is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not generally apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the county must release the submitted custodial death report pursuant to article 49.18(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Next, we note some of the responsive information is subject to section 552.022(a) of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part:

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

---

<sup>3</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>4</sup> In that instance, as we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

- (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). We note the responsive information contains completed investigations and reports subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The county 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 expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). Although you assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider these exceptions for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> Further, we will consider your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* This office has concluded that a governmental body’s receipt of a claim letter that it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the “TTCA”), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor that we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996). Other evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”).

Upon review, we find the county has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation when the county received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the county has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Furthermore, we note the county has not shown it is a party to any pending litigation. Thus, we find the county has failed to establish it was a party to pending litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center (“TCIC”). *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that DPS maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided by chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those

entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F, of the Government Code. We note, because the laws governing the dissemination of information obtained from the NCIC or TCIC are based on both law enforcement and privacy interests, the CHRI of a deceased individual that is obtained from the DPS or another criminal justice agency may be disseminated only as permitted by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 565 at 10-12. Upon review, we find the information we marked and indicated consists of CHRI which the county must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has determined the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Under this definition, a deceased person cannot be a patient under section 159.002 of the MPA. *See* ORDs 487, 370, 343. Thus, the MPA is applicable only to records related to a person who was alive at the time of diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment to which the records pertain. Upon review, we find the information we marked and indicated is confidential under the MPA. Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429

U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fadlo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual’s privacy interest against the public’s interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure;” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found that “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” ORD 185. Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs which identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 428 and 430. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Upon review, we find some of the remaining responsive information, which we marked and indicated, falls within the zones of privacy and implicates an individual’s privacy for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

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). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note, however, because “the right of privacy is purely personal[,]” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded”) (quoting Restatement of Torts 2d); see Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are ... of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining responsive information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, with the exception of the information pertaining to the deceased individual, the county must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information, a representative sample of which we indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 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. 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).

You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the county and the sheriff's office. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county. You further state these 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 the information at issue. Thus, the county may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(2); see also id. § 552.003(1-b)* (defining "honorably retired" for purposes of the Act). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to current or honorably retired peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the county must withhold peace officer cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code in the remaining responsive information if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body.

In summary, to the extent the responsive information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, the county must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2022-19823 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The county must release the submitted custodial death report pursuant to article 49.18(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The county must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. The county must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The county must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. With the exception of the information pertaining to the deceased individual, the county must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information, a representative sample of which we indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The county may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county must withhold peace officer cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code in the remaining responsive information if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The county must release the remaining responsive information.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> We note the remaining information contains social security numbers. Subsection 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from

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,

D. Michelle Case  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DMH/eb

Ref: ID# 972938

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)