



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 28, 2008

Ms. Julia Gannaway
Lynn Pham & Ross, L.L.P.
306 West Broadway Avenue
Fort Worth, Texas 76104

OR2008-10185

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# 316988.

The City of Lockhart (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) the personnel file of a named fire fighter, (2) information related to a specified investigation of the named fire fighter, and (3) all correspondence between the city and any state agencies regarding the named fire fighter. You state that you will release some of the responsive information. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information relates to a sex offender who is subject to registration under chapter 62 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Article 62.051 of the Code of Criminal Procedure requires a sex offender registrant to provide the following information for the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") sex offender registration database: the person's full name; each alias; date of birth; sex; race; height; weight; eye color; hair color; social security number; driver's license number; shoe size; home address; a recent

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.

color photograph, or if possible, an electronic image of the person; a complete set of fingerprints; the type of offense the person was convicted of; the age of the victim; the date of conviction; the punishment received; an indication as to whether the person is discharged, paroled, or released on juvenile probation, community supervision, or mandatory supervision; an indication of each license, as defined by article 62.005(g), that is held or sought by the person; an indication as to whether the person is or will be employed, carrying on a vocation, or a student at a particular public or private institution of higher education in this state or another state, and the name and address of that institution; and any other information required by DPS. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 62.051(c). This information is public information with the exception of the person's social security number, driver's license number, telephone number, all information required by DPS outside of the enumerated categories of information, and any information that would identify the victim of the offense for which the person is subject to registration. *See id.* art. 62.005(b). We have marked the information that is subject to article 62.005, and the city must withhold or release this information in accordance with article 62.005(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by statute, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. 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 fire fighter's civil service file that the civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file that the fire department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a fire department investigates a fire fighter's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against the fire fighter, 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 a like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the fire fighter's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *See 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 fire department because of its investigation into a fire fighter's misconduct, and the fire department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a fire 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 state that Exhibit B is contained in the personnel file of the named fire fighter and that this information is maintained under section 143.089(g). Upon review, we agree that Exhibit B is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the "ADA"). *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a "fitness for duty examination" conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "EEOC") has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes "specific information about an individual's disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual." *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define "disability" for the purposes of the ADA as "(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment." 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue is confidential under the ADA. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.

Section 552.101 also encompasses criminal history record information ("CHRI") generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. 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 law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that the DPS may disseminate this information as provided in subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI, but 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.* §§ 411.090-411.127. Thus, any CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may not be made available to the

requestor except in accordance with federal regulations. *See* ORD 565 (1990). We note that driving record information is not made confidential by the confidentiality provisions that govern CHRI. *See* Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B) (definition of CHRI does not include driving record information). Upon review, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue constitutes CHRI made confidential under federal law or chapter 411. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of this information on that basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides for the confidentiality of records created or maintained by a mental health professional. Section 611.002(a) provides as follows:

Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 of the Health and Safety Code provide for access to information that is made confidential by section 611.002 only by certain individuals. *See id.* §§ 611.004, .0045; ORD 565. We have marked a mental health record that the city must withhold under section 611.002, unless the requestor is authorized to obtain that information under sections 611.004 and 611.0045.

Section 552.101 also encompasses Chapter 560 of the Government Code, which provides that a governmental body may not release fingerprint information except in certain limited circumstances. *See* Gov't Code §§ 560.001 (defining "biometric identifier" to include fingerprints), 560.002 (prescribing manner in which biometric identifiers must be maintained and circumstances in which they can be released), 560.003 (biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body exempt from disclosure under the Act). You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, that section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint information. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. The types 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. This office has also held that the compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the

publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States 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 that the compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.² However, there is a legitimate public interest in a public employee's work performance. *See Open Records Decision No. 444 at 5-6 (1986)* (public has interest in public employee's qualifications, work performance, and circumstances of employee's resignation or termination). The city must withhold the medical information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. None of the remaining information at issue may be withheld on this basis.

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 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 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 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)(A)-(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,

²We note, however, that records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history record information. *Cf. Gov't Code § 411.082(2)(B)* (criminal history record information does not include driving record information).

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 the documents in Exhibit E are communications between city attorneys and city employees. You indicate that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You also indicate that these communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the documents in Exhibit E. Accordingly, the city may withhold these documents under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security number, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.³ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The city may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee at issue elected confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. If the employee made a timely election, then the city must withhold the personal information we have marked. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1), however, if the employee at issue did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

In summary, the city must withhold or release the information we have marked in accordance with article 62.005(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code, the city must withhold: (1) Exhibit B under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code; (2) the mental health record we have marked under section 611.002 of the Health & Safety Code, unless the requestor is authorized to obtain that information under sections 611.004 and 611.0045; (3) the information we have marked under section 560.003 of the Government Code; and (4) the medical information we have marked under common-law privacy. The city may withhold the documents in Exhibit E under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.117 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Government Code, if the employee made a timely election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.⁴

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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.

⁴We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

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,



Bill Dobie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WJD/jh

Ref: ID# 316988

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Danny Robbins
Forth Worth Star-Telegram
P.O. Box 1870
Fort Worth, Texas 76101
(w/o enclosures)