



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 17, 2016

Ms. Jordan M. Powell
Assistant District Attorney
Caldwell County Criminal District Attorney's Office
1703 South Colorado Street, Box 5
Lockhart, Texas 78644

OR2016-03753

Dear Ms. Powell:

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# 598655 (reference nos. 2015-073 & 2015-076).

Caldwell County (the "county") received two requests from the same requestor for several categories of information pertaining to seven named individuals and a specified property.¹ You state you will release some information. You also state some of the requested information does not exist.² You argue some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the

¹You state the county sought and received clarification of one the requests for information. *See Gov't Code* § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed): Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.³

Initially, you assert a portion of the submitted information does not consist of public information that is subject to disclosure under the Act. The Act is applicable only to “public information.” *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) reads as follows:

(a) In this chapter, “public information” means information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Section 552.002(a-1) also provides the following:

Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and, thus, is subject to the Act. *Id.*

³We 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.

§ 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body, and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Further, information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity may be subject to disclosure under the Act if the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(3). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See id.* § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides that it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

We further note that the characterization of information as "public information" under the Act is not dependent on whether the requested records are in the possession of an individual or whether a governmental body has a particular policy or procedure that establishes a governmental body's access to the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 3-4 (1995) (finding that information does not fall outside definition of "public information" in Act merely because individual member of governmental body possesses information rather than governmental body as whole); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 425 (1985) (concluding, among other things, that information sent to individual school trustees' homes was public information because it related to official business of governmental body) (overruled on other grounds by Open Records Decision No. 439 (1986)). Thus, if the information at issue is related to the county's business, the mere fact it is not in the county's possession does not remove the information from the scope of the Act. *See* ORD 635 at 6-8 (stating that information maintained on a privately-owned medium and actually used in connection with the transaction of official business would be subject to the Act).

You inform us the named individuals, not the county, own the cellular telephones at issue and use the personal cellular phones for private matters. However, you state the individuals also use their cellular telephones in the performance of their official duties with the county. You further acknowledge that the county provides the named individuals with a stipend for their cellular telephones. We reiterate that information is within the scope of the Act if it relates to the official business of a governmental body and is maintained by a public official or employee of the governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Thus, to the extent the personal cellular telephone bills at issue do not relate to the official business of the county, they are not subject to the Act and need not be released. However, to the extent the requested personal cellular telephone bills relate to the official business of the county, they

are subject to the Act, and must be released unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See id.* §§ 552.301 (a), .302.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov't Code* § 552.107(1). 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).

You claim some of the submitted information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the county and representatives of the county made in furtherance of legal services rendered to the county. You state the communications at issue were intended to remain confidential and have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the submitted information. Accordingly, the county may

withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we note the remaining information at issue consists of a communication with a non-privileged party. Thus, we find the county has not demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information at issue and may not withhold it on this ground.

You also claim section 552.103 for the non-privileged communication at issue. Section 552.103 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was 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. *See 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

However, once information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). We note the opposing party to the pending litigation has seen or had access to the information at issue. Therefore, the county may not withhold this information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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 personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). This office has found financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. *See* ORDs 600, 523.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the county may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Thus, to the extent the employees at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. If the employees did not make a timely election under section 552.024, the county may not withhold the information

we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. We note section 552.117(a)(1) also encompasses an employee's personal cellular telephone or pager number if the employee pays for the cellular telephone or pager service with his or her personal funds. In this instance, you state the employees at issue receives a stipend from the county to assist in payment for their cellular telephone services. Thus, because the county pays for the cellular telephone service at issue, we conclude the county may not withhold their cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.117 not applicable to numbers for cellular mobile phones installed in county officials' and employees' private vehicles and intended for official business).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the county must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, to the extent the personal cellular telephone bills at issue do not relate to the official business of the county, they are not subject to the Act and need not be released. However, to the extent the requested personal cellular telephone bills relate to the official business of the county, they are subject to the Act, and must be released unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. The county may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the employees at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The county 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/dls

Ref: ID# 598655

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)