



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 2, 2015

Ms. Sarah R. Martin  
Assistant City Attorney  
Legal Division  
City of Arlington  
P.O. Box 1065  
Arlington, Texas 76004-1065

OR2015-25148

Dear Ms. Martin:

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# 588986 (Ref. No. 23324).

The Arlington Police Department (the "department") received a request for e-mails and text messages sent or received by a named department employee during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the department raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions in the Act. Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Further, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege in this instance are sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 677 (2002).

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

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 other statutes make confidential, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Upon review, we conclude the information in Exhibit D consists of law enforcement records involving juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision occurring after September 1, 1997; thus, Exhibit D is subject to section 58.007(c). *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of section 58.007). None of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, Exhibit D is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

*Id.* § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the information in Exhibits C and E was used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect by the department; thus, this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 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), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As the department does not indicate it has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we determine Exhibits C and E are confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Therefore, the department must withhold Exhibits C and E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982)*. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the department must withhold the medical records we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.<sup>5</sup> However, you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information constitutes medical records for purposes of the MPA and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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 . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d at 327 (Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1) protects information that, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980)

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

The department explains the information in Exhibit G consists of daily status e-mails regarding ongoing undercover narcotics and vice investigations, the release of which would reveal the locations and tactics of such undercover operations as well as the identities of undercover officers. Accordingly, the department argues the release of this information would allow criminals to “take evasive actions to avoid detection and give them an opportunity to relocate their operation” and jeopardize officer safety. Additionally, the department states the information in Exhibit H reveals the number and specific locations of department officers at AT&T Stadium (the “stadium”), as well as the times the officers will be at their positions. The department argues the release of such information would “equip criminals with guidance as to how and when to plan criminal activity within a similar event at the stadium by letting them know at what times and locations the stadium is most vulnerable.” Upon review, we find the department has demonstrated release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the department may withhold Exhibits G and H under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup>

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The department states the information in Exhibit B relates to ongoing criminal investigations and prosecutions. Upon review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibit B and the department may withhold it on that basis.

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

---

<sup>6</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>7</sup> However, the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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)

---

<sup>7</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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).

The department states the information in Exhibit I consists of communications between attorneys for the department and department employees. The department states the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the department has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the department may withhold Exhibit I under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993)*. The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990)*.

In *Open Records Decision No. 615*, we determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See ORD 615 at 5*. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995)*. Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see ORD 615 at 5*. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982)*.

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and

content of the final document. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

The department states the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the policymaking of the department. The information at issue also contains draft documents that we understand will be released to the public in final form. Upon review, we find the department has demonstrated the applicability of the deliberative process privilege to some of the information at issue; thus, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>8</sup> However, the remaining information at issue consists of general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002); *see City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 377 (Tex. 2000). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a)(1)-(2). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

---

<sup>8</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances . . . that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

*Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7. Upon review, we find the department has failed to establish the applicability of the attorney work product privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue as attorney work product under section 552.111 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).<sup>9</sup> *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not subject to subsection (c), and there is no indication the owner of the e-mail address has consented to release of her e-mail address. Accordingly, the department must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code. The department must withhold Exhibits C and E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The department must withhold the medical records we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The department may withhold Exhibits G and H under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1). The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department may withhold Exhibit I under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>9</sup>The 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).

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](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# 588986

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)