



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 13, 2005

Mr. R. Kevin Rhyne
Henslee Fowler Hepworth & Schwartz LLP
110 North College Avenue, Suite 1116
Tyler, Texas 75702

OR2005-05167

Dear Mr. Rhyne:

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# 225957.

The Chapel Hill Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) documents relating to firearms, (2) the personnel file of a district police officer, and (3) information relating to the use of district employees and equipment for purposes other than district business for a specified period of time. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, and 552.115 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information appears to be subject to a previous ruling issued by the office. On June 2, 2005, this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2005-04819 (2005). We presume that the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of this prior ruling. Thus, we determine that the district must continue to rely on our ruling in Open Records Letter No. 2005-04819 (2005) with respect to the submitted information addressed in that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); the governmental body which

received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). To the extent the submitted information was not addressed in Open Records Letter No. 2005-04819 (2005), we will address your claims for exception.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Under section 552.022(a)(3), information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body is expressly public unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Section 552.107 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. As such, it is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Therefore, this information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 (2002). The attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, and section 552.101 of the Government Code constitutes other law for purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, we will address whether the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted under rule 503 and section 552.101.

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

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).

In order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must do the following: (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* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). 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, 4527 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert that Exhibit D “contains information and correspondence forwarded to the District’s attorney by District administration as part of an ongoing investigation.” Based on this representation and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the information in Exhibit D subject to section 552.022 is part of privileged attorney-client communications that the district may withhold under rule 503.¹

You assert that the information in Exhibit D not subject to section 552.022 is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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 “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R.

¹Because we are able to resolve this under rule 503, we do not address your other arguments for exception of this information.

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 Texas 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 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 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, 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) 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).

Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information in Exhibit D not subject to 552.022 consists of privileged attorney-client communications. The district may thus withhold this information under section 552.107.

The district asserts that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. One of the documents at issue is a medical record, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides the following:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in

Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). The medical records must be released upon the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 159.004, 159.005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have marked the submitted information that constitutes a medical record and that may only be released in accordance with the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

The submitted information contains an I-9 form (Employment Eligibility Verification), which is governed by section 1324a of Title 8 of the United States Code. This section provides that an I-9 form and "any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter" and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the form in this instance would be "for purposes other than for enforcement" of the referenced federal statutes. Accordingly, we conclude that the marked I-9 form is confidential and may only be released in compliance with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that the word "teacher" for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and (2) is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. We also determined the word "administrator" for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and (2) is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

The submitted information contains the evaluations of a district police officer and a district administrator. Provided the administrator was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificate and was performing the functions of an administrator at the time of the submitted

evaluations, this individual's evaluations are confidential under section 21.355, and the district must withhold them under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You assert that the evaluations of the police officer are also confidential under section 21.355; however, you do not state or provide evidence that the officer held a teacher's certificate or permit or administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and was performing the functions of a teacher or administrator at the time of the evaluations. Thus, you have not established that the officer's evaluations are confidential under section 21.355, and the district may not withhold them under section 552.101 on that ground.

We have marked the evaluations that may be confidential under section 21.355. We conclude the remaining documents that you seek to withhold under section 21.355 do not consist of evaluations for purposes of section 21.355; therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

We understand you to assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.101 or 552.102 in conjunction with common law privacy. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976) for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. Accordingly, we address the district's section 552.102 common law privacy claim in conjunction with its section 552.101 privacy claim.

Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393

(1983), 339 (1982). But common law privacy does not protect an employee's social security number, date of birth, home address, or home telephone number. Attorney General Opinion MW-283 (1980) (public employee's date of birth not protected under privacy); Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers of private citizens generally not protected under privacy); Open Records Decision Nos. 226 (1979) (social security numbers not protected under privacy). In addition, this office has found that the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 542 at 5 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We have marked the information that is confidential under common law privacy and that the district must withhold under sections 552.101 and 552.102; however, the remaining information is not confidential under common law privacy, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 or 552.102 on that ground.

You assert that the submitted birth certificate is excepted under section 552.115 of the Government Code. Section 552.115(a) provides that “[a] birth or death record maintained by the bureau of vital statistics of the Texas Department of Health or a local registration official is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021[.]” Because section 552.115 only applies to information maintained by the bureau of vital statistics or local registration official, the district may not withhold the birth certificate pursuant to that provision. *See* Open Records Decision No. 338 (1982).

Some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure this same information regarding a peace officer, as defined by article 2.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, regardless of whether the officer elected under section 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code to keep such information confidential. We have marked the information of a district police officer that the district must withhold under section 552.117(a)(2). Pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the district must also withhold the information that we have marked pertaining to district employees if the employees elected to keep such information confidential prior to the district's receipt of the request for information. We note that an individual's personal post office box number is not a “home address” and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.117. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117; Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (purpose of section 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied).

Some of the information at issue may be excepted under section 552.1175 of the Government Code, which provides in part the following:

Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, or social security number of [a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure], or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

- (1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and
- (2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(b). We note that an individual's personal post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.1175. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (purpose of section 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied). The submitted documents contain information pertaining to a police officer who does not work for the district. If this individual is currently a licensed peace officer who elects to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.1175.

We note that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.130 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part the following:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130(a). The district must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136(b) states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that

is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” The district must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

To conclude, the district may withhold Exhibit D under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and section 552.107 of the Government Code. The marked medical records may only be released in accordance with the MPA and the marked I-9 form may only be released in compliance with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system. Pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code, the district must withhold the marked evaluations of the administrator. The district must also withhold the following: (1) the officer’s information marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; (2) the district employee information marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the employees elected to keep such information confidential prior to the district’s receipt of the request for information; (3) the information marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer who, in accordance with section 552.1175(b), elects to restrict access to this information; (4) the Texas motor vehicle record information marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (5) the account numbers marked under 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/seg

Ref: ID# 225957

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mark Collette
Staff Writer
Tyler Morning Paper
P.O. Box 2030
Tyler, Texas 75710
(w/o enclosures)