



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

This ruling has been modified by court action.
The ruling and judgment can be viewed in PDF
format below.



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 6, 2015

Ms. Heather Silver
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Manila, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

The ruling you have requested has been amended as a result of litigation and has been attached to this document.

OR2015-06486

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 558756.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for all information, records, and documents pertaining to a specified automobile accident involving the requestor's client. You state some information will be released to the requestor with redactions pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2011-18466 (2011).¹ You claim portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.117, 552.130,

¹Open Records Letter No. 2011-18466 is a previous determination issued to the city's police department authorizing it to withhold, without requesting a decision from this office, the addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

and 552.136 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

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 “to facilitate 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 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), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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).

²Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

³We 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.

You state Exhibit B consists of communications between attorneys in the city attorney's office and their client, city staff. You state these communications were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal services to the city. You further state these communications are confidential and were not intended to be disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You assert the dates of birth of members of the public are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on the basis of the decision in *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, No. D-1-GV-12-000861 (53rd Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex., July 11, 2013). 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. However, upon review, we find the court's decision, which the Office of the Attorney General appealed and is pending with the Third Court of Appeals of Texas, Case No. 03-13-00546-CV, is limited to the facts and information at issue in the underlying letter rulings, and does not apply to the information currently at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the dates of birth in the information at issue based on the court's decision in that case.

We understand you to contend the dates of birth at issue are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 521.051 of the Business and Commerce Code. Section 521.051(a) of the Business and Commerce Code provides:

A person may not obtain, possess, transfer, or use personal identifying information of another person without the other person's consent and with intent to obtain a good, a service, insurance, an extension of credit, or any other thing of value in the other person's name.

Bus. & Comm. Code § 521.051(a). "Personal identifying information" means "information that alone or in conjunction with other information identifies an individual" and includes an individual's date of birth. *Id.* § 521.002(a)(1)(A). You assert the marked dates of birth meet the definition of "personal identifying information" under section 521.002(a)(1) of the Business and Commerce Code. *See id.* § 521.002(a)(1). We note section 521.051(a) of the Business and Commerce Code does not prohibit the transfer of personal identifying information of another person unless the transfer is made with the intent to obtain a good, a service, insurance, an extension of credit, or any other thing of value in the other person's name without that person's consent. *See id.* § 521.051(a). In this instance, the city's release of the information at issue would be for the purpose of complying with the Act, and not "with intent to obtain a good, a service, insurance, an extension of credit, or any other thing of value[.]" *See id.* Therefore, section 521.051(a) of the Business and Commerce Code does not prohibit the city from transferring the requested information. Accordingly, the city may

not withhold the dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 521.051 of the Business and Commerce Code.

Section 552.101 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 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. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining submitted information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

However, the dates of birth of living members of the public are not protected by common-law privacy under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses, telephone numbers, and dates of birth not private). Upon review, we find the dates of birth of members of the public you have marked do not satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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, the city must withhold the employee date of birth you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental

body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the employee date of birth you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue is a current or former city employee who timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Abigail T. Adams".

Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 558756

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

OCT 21 2015

At 3:00 P M.
Velva L. Price, District Clerk

Cause No. D-1-GV-12-001471

CITY OF DALLAS,
Plaintiff,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

v.

GREG ABBOTT,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS,
Defendant.


TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

53rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT

FINAL JUDGMENT

On October 20, 2015, the above-styled and numbered cause came on for trial. Plaintiff, the City of Dallas, and Defendant, Ken Paxton, Attorney General of Texas, appeared by counsel of record and announced ready. This cause is an action under the Public Information Act (PIA), Tex. Gov't Code ch. 552, in which the City of Dallas (the "City"), sought to withhold certain information from public disclosure. The parties submitted all matters in controversy, legal and factual, to the Court. The Court renders judgment for the City of Dallas.


In accordance with *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied), it is ADJUDGED, ORDERED, and DECREED that the dates of birth of members of the public that are subject to the following attorney general rulings are excepted from disclosure under PIA section 552.101 as information coming within the common-law right of privacy: OR2012-15687, OR2013-13460, OR2013-14173, OR2013-15029, OR2014-02027, OR2014-03053, OR2014-10958, OR2014-12007, OR2014-13280, OR2015-00856, OR2015-03225, OR2015-04746, OR2015-06486, OR2015-09796, OR2015-09650, OR2015-12740, OR2015-12882, OR2015-11167, OR2015-12505, OR2015-14442, OR2015-12568, OR2015-15076, OR2015-14991, OR2015-15428, OR2015-15574, OR2015-16409, OR2015-16823, OR2015-17001, OR2015-16711, OR2015-17686, OR2015-17639, and OR2015-18652.




All relief not expressly granted is denied.

This judgment disposes of all claims between all parties and is a final judgment.

SIGNED on the 20th day of OCTOBER, 2015.


PRESIDING JUDGE

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


JAMES B. PINSON
State Bar No. 16017700
Assistant City Attorney
Dallas City Attorney's Office
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas
Telephone: (214) 670-3519
Facsimile: (214) 670-0622
james.pinson@dallascityhall.com

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF,
THE CITY OF DALLAS


KIMBERLY FUCHS
State Bar No. 24044140
Chief, Open Records Litigation
Administrative Law Division
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
Telephone: (512) 475-4195
Facsimile: (512) 320-0167
kimberly.fuchs@texasattorneygeneral.gov

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT,
KEN PAXTON, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF TEXAS