



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 18, 2006

Ms. Kathleen Weisskopf
Assistant City Attorney
City of Arlington
201 East Abram St., Ste. 300
Arlington, Texas 76004-3231

OR2006-10811

Dear Ms. Weisskopf:

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# 259560.

The City of Arlington (the "city") received a request for several categories of information regarding the Arlington Police Department Property room (the "property room") since 2001. You state that some of the requested information will be released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

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 "for the

¹We 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.

purpose of facilitating 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “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).

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, no writ). 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 that Exhibit D consists of confidential communications between city attorneys and employees of the department. You also state that these communications were made in confidence, are intended for the sole use of the department, and have not been shared or distributed to others. Based on your representations and our review, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit D. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold Exhibit D pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You claim that Exhibits B and C are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime[.]

(b) An 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 is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal investigation that is purely administrative in nature. See *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). You state that Exhibit C consists of records relating to ongoing criminal investigations of property room employees. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of Exhibit C would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

We note, however, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrest, an arrested person, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Although section 552.108(a)(1) authorizes you to withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C from disclosure, you may choose to release all or part of it that is not otherwise confidential by law. See Gov't Code § 552.007.

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.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded that this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department's use of force policy), 508 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution), 211 (1978) (information relating to undercover narcotics investigations), 143 (1977) (log revealing use of electronic eavesdropping equipment). To claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection, however, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further,

commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *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 are not protected under section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) exempts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement; the determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

In this instance, you state that the marked portions of Exhibit B consist of information concerning security measures and other sensitive information regarding the property room. You state that release of this information would interfere with the Arlington Police Department's (the "department") ability to operate safe and secure facilities. You explain that the marked portions relate to procedural measures such as "intake, securing and maintenance and disposal of evidence, including weapons, narcotics, cash and valuables seized by the [department] in the course of their duties." Thus, you state that releasing this information would "undermine the security of the [p]roperty room and its content, thereby directly impacting cases [and] pending prosecution . . . [or] allow an individual the opportunity to thwart those measures." Based on these representations and our review, we agree that most of the information you have marked in Exhibit B would, if released, interfere with law enforcement. Thus, you may withhold this information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. As to the remaining marked information in Exhibit B, you have failed to demonstrate that releasing the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, this information may not be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) and we have marked it for release.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.107 of the Government Code. With the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Additionally, with the exception of the information marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit B under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jaclyn N. Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JNT/ir

Ref: ID# 259560

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mitch Mitchell
Arlington Star-Telegram
PO Box 915006
Fort Worth, TX 76115
(w/o enclosures)