



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 23, 2016

Ms. Elizabeth Lutton
Legal Advisor
Dallas County Sheriff's Department
133 North Riverfront Boulevard, LB-31
Dallas, Texas 75207-4313

OR2016-06621

Dear Ms. Lutton:

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# 602494.

The Dallas County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for "requests for immigration holds and/or notification[s] of release" received by the department for a specified time period, including two specified forms, and policies and communications pertaining to immigration holds and undocumented immigrants. You state the department will release some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which consist of representative samples.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of

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

Federal Regulations,² which protects information regarding detainees held on behalf of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the “INS”).³ This section provides as follows:

No person, including any state or local government entity or any privately operated detention facility, that houses, maintains, provides services to, or otherwise holds any detainee on behalf of the [INS] (whether by contract or otherwise), and no other person who by virtue of any official or contractual relationship with such person obtains information relating to any detainee, shall disclose or otherwise permit to be made public the name of, or other information relating to, such detainee. Such information shall be under the control of the [INS] and shall be subject to public disclosure only pursuant to the provisions of applicable federal laws, regulations and executive orders. Insofar as any documents or other records contain such information, such documents shall not be public records. This section applies to all persons and information identified or described in it, regardless of when such persons obtained such information, and applies to all requests for public disclosure of such information, including requests that are the subject of proceedings pending as of April 17, 2002.

8 C.F.R. § 236.6. The department asserts Exhibit 2 pertains to INS detainees. Based on this representation and our review, we agree the department is required to abide by rules promulgated by the INS with regard to INS detainees. *See id.* § 2.1 (providing that Secretary of Homeland Security may issue regulations to administer and enforce laws relating to immigration and naturalization of aliens); *see also ACLU of N.J., Inc. v. County of Hudson*, 799 A.2d 629 (N.J. 2002) (stating that while state possesses sovereign authority over operation of its jails, it may not operate them, in respect to INS detainees, in any way that derogates federal government’s exclusive and expressed interest in regulating aliens). The department does not provide our office with any applicable federal law, regulation, or executive order that provides the requestor with a right of access to the information at issue. We therefore conclude Exhibit 2 is made confidential by section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations and must be withheld from the requestor pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code (providing that the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish regulations necessary to carry out laws relating to immigration and naturalization) and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See ACLU*, 799 A.2d at 655 (concluding that because INS had authority to promulgate 8 C.F.R. § 236.6, provision preempts state law requiring disclosure of requested information); *see also English v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 496

²Section 552.101 encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. A federal statute or an administrative regulation enacted pursuant to statutory authority can provide statutory confidentiality for purposes of section 552.101. *See Open Records Decision No. 476* (1987) (addressing statutory predecessor).

³We note that the functions of the INS were transferred to the Department of Homeland Security on March 1, 2003. *See Homeland Security Act of 2002*, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002). However, as section 236.6 still refers to the agency at issue as “the INS,” we will also do so in this ruling.

U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting that state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting that federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(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 claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of 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 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the department's receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Mercado v. Dallas County*, Cause No. 3:15-cv-03481-D, was filed and is currently pending against the department in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the department received the present request for information. You also state Exhibit 5 was created for the pending litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit 5 is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the department may withhold Exhibit 5 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the 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 all parties to the pending litigation is not

excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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).

You claim Exhibit 4 is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You assert the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the department and Dallas County and department employees. You indicate the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department and these communications were intended to be confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the department may generally withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and an attachment received from individuals the department has not

demonstrated are privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails and the attachment received from non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails and attachment, which we have marked, are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the department may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachment 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 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that 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 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

We note section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (Gov’t Code § 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body’s request and performing task that is within governmental body’s authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (Gov’t Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (Gov’t Code § 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body’s consultants).

In order for section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

The department asserts Exhibit 3 consists of e-mails between the sheriff and the sheriff's executive staff regarding various immigration matters. Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with one of the individuals in the remaining information at issue. Thus, we find the department failed to show this information consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations regarding policymaking matters of the department. Further, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. As a result, we find the department failed to demonstrate this information consists of advice, opinion, or recommendation relating to policymaking. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, we note they may contain information subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the e-mail addresses in the non-privileged e-mail strings under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1103(a)(3) of title 8 of the United States Code and section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The department may

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

withhold Exhibit 5 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The department may generally withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the non-privileged e-mails and attachment, which we have marked, are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the department may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachment under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses in the information at issue under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. The department 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 Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/akg

Ref: ID# 602494

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)