



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2011

Ms. J. Middlebrooks
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Section
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2011-05993

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

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# 416126 (DPD Public Information request #2010-1145).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information related to a named city police officer. You claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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

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.

test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. 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. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). This office has also found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. See generally Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 373 (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Whether information is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore not protected by common-law privacy must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983). Upon review, we find that the information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."² Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court recently held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010). Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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 Tex. Farmers*

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.102 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions.

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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. See 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 pet). 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 you have marked constitutes a communication between the city’s police department and an attorney for the city that was made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city. You state that this communication was made in confidence and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked, and the city may withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer’s home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). You explain an employee’s identification number is also used as an employee’s credit union bank account number. Thus, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Tamara Wilcox
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TW/bs

Ref: ID# 416126

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)