



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 15, 2015

Mr. Michael Bostic
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-09501

Dear Mr. Bostic:

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# 563737.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified case file number. You state the city will release some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the information in Exhibit B are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Further, although you take no position as to whether the information in Exhibit C is excepted under the Act, you state release of Exhibit C may implicate the proprietary interests of Omnium Management Company ("Omnium"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Omnium of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances).

We have received comments from Omnium.¹ We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents and a completed report subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108; [and]

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (17). The city must release the completed report pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17), which we have marked, unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek to withhold the completed report under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, section 552.107(1) is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 6 (2002) (Gov't Code § 552.107(1) is not other law for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.022), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally).* Therefore, the city may not withhold the completed report subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will address your claim under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise

¹We note although Omnium raises section 552.305 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.024, .301, .305.*

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17), we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Thus, the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17) may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you do not raise another exception to disclosure of the court-filed documents, the city must release them under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication

transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD No. 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You contend the information you have marked consists of communications between city employees and city attorneys. You state these communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city has established the information at issue constitutes attorney-client communications the city may withhold under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

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 information protected by federal and state law. You assert some of the remaining information is confidential under section 103.330 of title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code, and section 301.085 of the Property Code. *See* 24 C.F.R. § 103.330; *see also* 42 U.S.C. § 3610(b); Prop. Code § 301.085. Part 103 applies to complaints alleging discriminatory housing practices because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and complaints alleging discriminatory housing practices on account of handicap or familial status occurring on or after March 12, 1989. 24 C.F.R. § 103.1(b). Upon the filing of a complaint, both federal and state law mirror each other in language and encourage conciliation to the extent feasible. Section 103.330 provides the following:

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section and § 103.230(c), nothing that is said or done in the course of conciliation under this part may be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent administrative hearing under Part 180 or in civil actions under Title VIII of the Fair Housing Act, without the written consent of the persons concerned.

Id. § 103.330(a); *see id.* § 103.9 (defining conciliation for purposes of part 103). Section 3610 of title 42 of the United States Code provides, in pertinent part:

(d) Prohibitions and requirements with respect to disclosure of information

(1) Nothing said or done in the course of conciliation under this subchapter may be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this subchapter without the written consent of the persons concerned.

42 U.S.C. § 3610(d)(1). Section 301.085 of the Property Code provides, in pertinent part:

(e) Statements made or actions taken in the conciliation may not be made public or used as evidence in a subsequent proceeding under this chapter without the written consent of the persons concerned.

Prop. Code § 301.085(e). You indicate the information at issue consists of statements made or actions taken in the course of conciliation in relation to a fair housing complaint. You do not indicate all concerned parties have consented to the release of the information at issue. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and section 301.085 of the Property Code.

The city and Omnium claim portions of the remaining information are confidential under common-law privacy. 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. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* 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 the information we have marked satisfies 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 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, the city and Omnium have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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

Omnium states portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . It may . . . relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.⁴ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a prima facie case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the

⁴The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we conclude Omnium has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Omnium demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Further, we find Omnium has not established any of the remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).⁵ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c), and you do not indicate the owner of the e-mail address has consented to release of his e-mail address. Therefore, we find the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Omnium raises section 552.147 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.147(a) excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.147. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information contains the social security number of a living person; thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental

⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city may withhold the privileged attorney-client communications you have indicated under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and section 301.085 of the Property 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 e-mail address we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, the city may only release information subject to copyright in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 563737

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David B. Koch
Counsel for Omnium Management Company
Wright, Ginsberg, Brusilow, P.C.
14755 Preston Road, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75254
(w/o enclosures)