



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 19, 2013

Ms. Michelle M. Kretz
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2013-14413

Dear Ms. Kretz:

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# 496595 (City PIR Nos. W025674 and W026227).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for records pertaining to two named individuals, including personnel files, disciplinary records, and related e-mails of named individuals.¹ You state the city will release some information to the requestor. You further state the city has redacted information as permitted by sections 552.024(c), 552.130(c), and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 684 (2009).² You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted

¹We note the city sought and received clarification regarding the requests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). You also inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for one of the requests under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the city received. *See* Gov't Code § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

²Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes

from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.107 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 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 that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. The types of information considered intimate or 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. *See id.* at 683. This office has concluded personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 600* (1992) (employee’s designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600* at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Upon review, we agree portions of the information at issue are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public

a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the employee or official or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See Gov’t Code §§ 552.117, .024(c)*. Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1* (to be codified as an amendment to Gov’t Code § 552.130(c)). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See Gov’t Code § 552.130(d), (e)*. Section 552.147 permits a governmental body to redact the social security number of a living person without requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). *Open Records Decision No. 684* is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including W-2 and W-4 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court 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.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth that you have marked 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. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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 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 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 a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies to only 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 to only a confidential communication, *id.*, 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, 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 you have marked consists of a communication between an assistant city attorney and city personnel made for the purpose of providing professional legal services to the city. You further state the communication at issue was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you have marked consists of a privileged attorney-client communication the city may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the information you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 496595

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)