



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 6, 2007

Ms. Julia Gannaway
For the City of Waxahachie
Lynn Pham & Ross, L.L.P
1320 South University Drive, Suite 720
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2007-08523

Dear Ms. Gannaway:

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# 283275.

The City of Waxahachie (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to documents prepared by the former police chief. You state that the majority of the requested information will be released to the requestor, but claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 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 required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. Gov't Code § 552.101. You state that the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files, a police officer's civil service file that the civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file that the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department investigates an officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against the officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature

from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the city police department because of its investigation into a police officer's misconduct, and the police department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* at 120, 122. Such records are subject to release under the Act. See Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You inform us that a portion of the submitted information is contained in the police department's internal files, which you indicate are maintained under section 143.089(g). Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the information in Exhibit B-Attachment 1 and the marked information in Exhibit B-Attachment 2 must be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy. Information is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy when (1) it is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Information may also be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy upon a showing of “special circumstances.” See Open Records Decision No. 169 (1977). This office considers “special circumstances” to refer to a very narrow set of situations in which the release of information would likely cause someone to face “an imminent threat of physical danger.” *Id.* at 6. Such “special circumstances” do not include “a generalized and speculative fear of harassment or retribution.” *Id.*

After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we find that you have established that the identifying information of the undercover narcotics officer in the information at issue is confidential under the “special circumstances” aspect of common-law

privacy; therefore, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1), 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 that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* 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. *See In re Texas 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. *See* 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). Section 552.107 may except from disclosure notes in an attorney’s client file if they contain confidences of the client or reveal the opinions, advice, or recommendations that have been made or will be made to the client or associated attorneys. Open Records Decision No. 574 at 6 (1990).

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, 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

¹Although you did not timely raise the “special circumstances” aspect of common-law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code, such an assertion constitutes a *compelling reason* to withhold information, and we will address your arguments under section 552.101 on this basis. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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 argue that a portion of the submitted information is protected by the attorney-client privilege. You explain that this information reflects confidential communications between the city's legal counsel and city employees. You have also submitted an affidavit from an attorney for the city who indicates that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude that the city may withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit C-Attachment 1 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the marked information in Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and common-law privacy and special circumstances. The city may withhold the marked information in Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.²

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,

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments for this information.

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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 283275

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. JoAnn Livingston
Managing Editor
Waxahachie Daily Light
P.O. Box 877
Waxahachie, Texas 75165
(w/o enclosures)