



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 8, 2016

Mr. Guillermo Trevino  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-20317

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 626181(Fort Worth PIR No. W052809).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to employment records of a named individual. You state some information has been released to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which you marked as Exhibit C-1, is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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 information at issue is part of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Thus, 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 expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11(governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1)), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions).* Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information at issue in Exhibit C-1.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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 not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of

professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the information at issue consists of a communication between the city attorney's office and city staff. You also state the communication was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and its staff. Further, you state the communication was intended to be confidential and its confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find you have established the information at issue constitutes an attorney-client communication under Rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information you marked as Exhibit C-1 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. This office has concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim or witness of sexual harassment must be withheld under common-law privacy. *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). Upon review, we find the information you marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you marked in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you marked as Exhibit C-1 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must withhold the information you marked in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/akg

Ref: ID# 626181

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)