



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 28, 2015

Ms. Tiffany Evans
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2015-27114

Dear Ms. Evans:

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# 592019 (GC# 22721).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for investigative materials, grievance materials, and the employee file for the requestor's client, as well as specified employee policies. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 other statutes, such as section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which renders tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as:

a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or

¹We 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.

any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]

26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Chamberlain v. Kurtz*, 589 F.2d 827, 840-41 (5th Cir. 1979); *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). As a federal law, section 6103(a) preempts any conflicting state provisions. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D.Tex. 1995). Thus, the submitted W-4 forms are generally confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law.

However, subsections (c) and (e) of section 6103 are exceptions to the confidentiality provisions of section 6103(a) and provide for disclosure of tax information to the taxpayer or the taxpayer’s designee. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(c), (e)(1)(A)(I) (tax return information may be disclosed to taxpayer), (e)(7) (information may be disclosed to any person authorized by subsection(e) to obtain such information if Secretary of Treasury determines such disclosure would not seriously impair tax administration); *see also Lake v. Rubin*, 162 F.3d 113 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (section 6103 represents exclusive statutory route for taxpayer to gain access to own return information and overrides individual’s right of access under the federal Freedom of Information Act). The submitted W-4 forms belong to the requestor’s client. Therefore, the city must release the submitted W-4 forms to this requestor pursuant to section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code.

We note the submitted information contains fingerprints, the public availability of which is governed by sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 of the Government Code. Section 560.003 of the Government Code provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). Section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, however, “[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]” *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). In this instance, the requestor is the attorney for the individual whose fingerprints are at issue. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his client’s fingerprints under section 560.002(1)(A). The general exceptions found in the Act, such as sections 552.103 of the Government Code, cannot impinge on a statutory right of access to information. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993), 451 at 4 (1986)*. Therefore, the city must release the requestor’s client’s fingerprints to him pursuant to section 560.002 of the Government Code.

We note, and you acknowledge, the remaining information contains information 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains completed investigations and evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the completed evaluations, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). As such, section 552.103 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold the completed evaluations under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, you seek to withhold the submitted completed investigations under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the submitted completed investigations. We will also address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 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 it is 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You claim the submitted completed investigations are protected by the attorney-client privilege. You state, pursuant to City of Houston Executive Order 1-39 (Revised), the Office of the Inspector General (the "OIG") is a division of the city's Office of the City Attorney and acts under that office's supervision. You inform us the information at issue was communicated between employees of the OIG in their capacities as attorneys and attorney representatives and employees of the city in their capacities as clients and client representatives. You explain this information was created in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state this information was not intended for release to third parties, and the confidentiality of this information 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. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney's entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted completed investigations under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or

employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You argue the remaining submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code. You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city received a notice of representation from the requestor regarding her client's complaints against the city simultaneously with the city's receipt of the instant request. We note the requestor directs the city to "preserve potential evidence in connection with any anticipated litigation" pertaining to her client's complaints. Based on your representations, our review of the submitted documentation, and the totality of circumstances, we find the city has demonstrated it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find the city has established the remaining

information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, the city must release the submitted W-4 forms to this requestor pursuant to section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must release the requestor's client's fingerprints to him pursuant to section 560.002 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the submitted completed investigations under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the remaining submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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,



Joseph Keeney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDK/dls

Ref: ID# 592019

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)