



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 19, 2005

Ms. Julia Gannaway
Lynn Pham Moore & Ross, L.L.P.
University Centre II
1320 South University Drive, Suite 720
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2005-03367

Dear Ms. Gannaway:

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# 222330.

The City of Richardson (the "city") received two requests for information related to a specified former employee. You state you have released some information but claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

¹ We assume that the samples 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.

(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). Upon review, we find that Exhibits C and D constitute information in a completed sexual harassment investigation conducted by the city. Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022, the city must release Exhibits C and D unless they are confidential under other law. We first address your claims regarding Exhibit C.

You claim that Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure as privileged attorney-client communications under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002) (governmental body may waive section 552.107); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Nevertheless, the attorney-client privilege is found in Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider your privilege claim pursuant to Rule 503. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 5-6 (2002).

Rule 503 provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; 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 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). Thus, 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. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under Rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You indicate that Exhibit C is a representative sample of communications between city personnel and the city’s attorney made for the purposes of rendering legal services to the city. You further indicate that these communications were intended to be confidential and that the confidentiality has been maintained. In support of your arguments, you have submitted Exhibit B, consisting of an affidavit from the city’s attorney and related attachments, which you assert “states in detail the communications, advice and guidance he provided to the [c]ity during” the investigation at issue.² Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that Exhibit C is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the city may withhold this type of information pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.³ *See also Harlandale Independent School District*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex.App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding that attorney’s entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice).

We now turn to your claim that some of the information submitted as Exhibit D is excepted from disclosure by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Because section 552.101 constitutes other law for purposes of section 552.022, we will consider the applicability of this exception to Exhibit D. Section 552.101 excepts “information considered to be

² We note that Exhibit B is not responsive to the request and appears to have been submitted for informational purposes only. We do not address in this ruling the applicability of the Public Information Act to that information.

³ As our ruling on this issue is dispositive as to Exhibit C, we do not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this exhibit.

confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision” and encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. In order for information to be protected by common law privacy it must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The *Industrial Foundation* court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685.

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation into allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the accused individual responding to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public’s interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that “the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released.” *Id.*

In accordance with the common law privacy principles discussed in *Ellen*, the city must withhold the identifying information that we have marked. The remaining information must be released.

Lastly, you claim the information submitted as Exhibits E and F is excepted from disclosure by section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that Exhibits E and F are representative samples of records that relate to a pending criminal investigation conducted by the city’s police department. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to

the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. Thus, with the exception of the basic front page offense and arrest information, you may withhold Exhibits E and F based on section 552.108(a)(1). We note that you have the discretion to release all or part of the remaining information that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov't Code § 552.007.

In summary, Exhibit C may be withheld pursuant to the attorney-client privilege in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have marked the information in Exhibit D which must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy; the remaining information in Exhibit D must be released. Except for basic information, the city may withhold Exhibits E and F under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/jev

Ref: ID# 222330

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Wendy Hundley
Dallas Morning News
1410 East Renner Road, Suite 260
Richardson, Texas 75082
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Priscilla Rice
KDFW Fox Television
400 North Griffin Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)