



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 17, 2014

Ms. Julie P. Doshier  
Counsel for the City of Highland Village  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
500 North Akard Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2014-16448

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 536415.

The City of Highland Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for investigation and complaint information involving a named individual and specified address.<sup>1</sup> You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.147 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You state the information you have marked relates to an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city's police department. *See id.* §§ 261.001 (defining "abuse" and "neglect" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. You do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the information you have marked is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See* 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. *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 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. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.*, 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. *See 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 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 attorney for the city and city employees made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also state the communication was made in confidence and the confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You have marked some of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(b)(2) protects “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 . . . if . . . the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). The information at issue was generated as part of an internal administrative investigation conducted by the city’s police department. You do not indicate the internal investigation resulted in a criminal investigation or prosecution that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. We therefore conclude you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(b)(2) and the city may not withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(b)(2).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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 test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has determined common-law privacy generally protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.007(c). Thus, to the extent the information we have indicated pertains to an offender who was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the commission of the crime, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 261.201 of the Family Code in conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code. To the extent the information we have indicated pertains to an offender who was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the commission of the crime, the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue<sup>4</sup> 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](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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/som

Ref: ID# 536415

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)