



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 10, 2016

Mr. William Schultz  
Assistant District Attorney  
Civil Division  
County of Denton  
1450 East McKinney, Suite 3100  
Denton, Texas 76209

OR2016-18052

Dear Mr. Schultz:

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# 622571 (County ID# 622571).

The Denton County Adult Probation Department (the "county") received a request for a complete investigation file related to a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101, 552.108, 552.111, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 509 and rule 510 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(17) provides for the required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record" unless it is "made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]" Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for this information, this is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for some of the submitted information, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney work product privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.111 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

(1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). As such, section 552.108 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the marked court-filed document may not be withheld under section 552.108. Further, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Austin Chronicle Corp. v. City of Austin*, No. 03-08-00596-CV, 2009 WL 483232 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 24, 2009, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); *see also Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the county may not withhold information contained in the court-filed document under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure of this information, the county must release it.

Next, you argue portions of the information not subject to section 552.022 are excepted from public disclosure under Texas Rules of Evidence 509 and 510. We note the Act differs in purpose from statutes and procedural rules providing for discovery in judicial proceedings. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.005 (chapter 552 does not affect scope of civil discovery), .006 (chapter 552 does not authorize withholding public information or limit availability of public information to public except as expressly provided by chapter 552); Open Records Decision No. 647 at 2 (1996) (section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges). Further, this office generally does not address evidentiary rules that may or may not be applicable to information submitted to our office by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 416* (1984) (finding that even if evidentiary rule specified that certain information may not be publicly released during trial, it would have no effect on disclosability under Act). Accordingly, we conclude the county may not withhold any portion of the information at issue pursuant to the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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. We understand you to raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2* (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also Attorney General Opinion JC-0508* at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164*. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In Open Records Decision No. 681, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of

the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *Id.*; see 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” ORD 681 at 8; see also Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. Therefore, we held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. See *Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; see also Open Records Decision No. 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the county may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code states, in pertinent part, the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [is excepted from required public disclosure] if:

...

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

...

(b) An 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 is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). A governmental body claiming an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). In *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. 1994), the Texas Supreme Court held a request for a district attorney's "entire litigation file" was "too broad" and, quoting *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." 873 S.W.2d at 380. However, a party is not prevented from requesting specific documents or categories of documents relevant to issues in a pending case, even though some or all of the documents may be contained in an attorney's files. *National Union*, 863 S.W.2d at 461.

Upon review, we find the request for information, which seeks an investigation file from the county, does not constitute a request for a prosecutor's litigation file for purposes of section 552.108. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue was prepared by the Denton County District Attorney's Office in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation or represents the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state. Accordingly, the county may not withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.108(a)(4) or section 552.108(b)(3) of the Government Code in conjunction with *Curry*.

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 section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). 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). 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. Tex. R. Civ.

P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation 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.

You assert some of the information not subject to section 552.022 consists of attorney work product. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue consists of material prepared, mental impressions developed, or a communication made for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>2</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus,

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a).

public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. Thus, the county must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides, "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by subsection (c).<sup>3</sup> *Id.* § 552.137(a)–(c). The county must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides, "[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from" required public disclosure under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147. Accordingly, the county may withhold the social security numbers in the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must release the information we have marked under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The county must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The county must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release. The county may withhold the social security numbers in the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code. 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480(1987), 470 (1987).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Behnke", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 622571

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)