



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 28, 2004

Mr. John T. Patterson  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Waco  
P.O. Box 2570  
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2004-9212

Dear Mr. Patterson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 211699.

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for records pertaining to a specified incident and physical hazards in a specified city park. You indicate that some information has been released but claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You assert that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) excepts from disclosure information protected by 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 "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body.<sup>1</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1).

---

<sup>1</sup> The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a 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). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, 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.<sup>2</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that was “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).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication 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, no writ). 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) of the Government Code 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 state that the marked portions of Exhibit 5 reflect a conversation between city employees and an assistant city attorney “wherein the attorney gave legal advice to the city employees.” Upon review of your representations and the information at issue, we find that you have established that this information consists of a confidential communication between client representatives and an attorney made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Therefore, the city may withhold the marked portions of Exhibit 5 under section 552.107(1).

You assert that Exhibit 4 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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 . . . if: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution.” Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to

---

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); *see also id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining “representative of the client,” “representative of the lawyer”).

anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). In addition, generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under law enforcement exception), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984) (construing statutory predecessor).

You state that Exhibit 4 pertains to “inquiries regarding a specified vehicle” and that release of this kind of information “could reveal when law enforcement is tracking certain vehicles as being suspected stolen vehicles.” You also inform us that “if the City were required to release this kind of information, suspects that obtained this kind of information would have a distinct advantage in efforts of avoiding detection and apprehension by law enforcement.” Having considered your arguments and reviewed Exhibit 4, we find that you have failed to explain how and why release of this information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* ORD 562 at 10. Therefore, none of the information in Exhibit 4 may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(b)(1).

Finally, you assert that the marked portions of Exhibit 3 are subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a Texas motor vehicle driver’s license and information relating to a Texas motor vehicle title or registration. Gov’t Code § 552.130. We note that Exhibit 4 also contains information that is subject to section 552.130, which we have marked. However, section 552.130 is designed to protect individuals’ privacy and that the right to privacy expires at death. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters. Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984); H-917 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981). Accordingly, the city must withhold Texas driver’s license and motor vehicle record information that pertains to persons who are living and vehicles in which living individuals have an ownership interest under section 552.130. Texas driver’s license information and information from motor vehicle records that were issued to persons who are now deceased may not be withheld under section 552.130.

In summary, the city may withhold the marked portions of Exhibit 5 under section 552.107. The city must withhold Texas-issued driver's license and motor vehicle record information in Exhibits 3 and 4 that pertains to living individuals or automobiles in which living individuals have an ownership interest under section 552.130. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJB/ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 211699

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeffrey Mundy  
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1230  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)