



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 6, 2007

Mr. Robert T. Bass
Allison, Bass & Associates, L.L.P.
A.O. Watson House
402 West 12th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2007-08542

Dear Mr. Bass:

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# 283049.

The Jack County Judge's Office (the "county"), which you represent, received three requests for any and all documents related to the official website of Jack County and the registered e-mail address and official e-mail address of the county judge. You state that a portion of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You assert that a portion of the remaining information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, you raise sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.109, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also considered comments received from the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (any person may submit written comments stating why information at issue in a request for attorney general decision should or should not be released).

¹We assume that the "representative sample" 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.

Initially, you note that the Act does not apply to records of the judiciary. Gov't Code § 552.003(B). The purposes and limits of the judiciary exception were construed in *Benavides v. Lee*, 665 S.W.2d 151 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1983, no writ). The court explained the purpose of the judiciary exception:

The judiciary exception . . . is important to safeguard judicial proceedings and maintain the independence of the judicial branch of government, preserving statutory and case law already governing access to judicial records. But it must not be extended to every governmental entity having any connection with the judiciary.

Id. at 152. Thus, to fall within the judiciary exception, the document must contain information that pertains to judicial proceedings. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 527 (1989) (Court Reporters Certification Board not part of judiciary because its records do not pertain to judicial proceedings), 204 (1978) (information held by county judge that does not pertain to proceedings before county court subject to Act).

A portion of the submitted information relates to judicial proceedings. Because these records, which we have marked, are maintained by the county judge for the county court, they are not subject to the Act, and the county need not release this marked information. Gov't Code § 552.0035 (access to information maintained by or for judiciary is governed by rules adopted by supreme court); *see* Tex. R. Jud. Admin. 12 (public access to judicial records); Attorney General Opinion DM-166 (1992).

You also argue that a portion of the requested information does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. The Act is only applicable to "public information." *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines public information as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it." Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if it is maintained for a governmental body, the governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information, and the information pertains to the transaction of official business. *See* Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987).

After reviewing the submitted emails, we have marked the information that is not work related and therefore, does not constitute "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business" by or for the county. *See* Gov't Code § 552.021; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving de minimis use of state resources).

Furthermore, we note that in Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined that certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. Based on the reasoning in that decision and our review of the information at issue, we determine that portions of the remaining information at issue include source codes, account user names, passwords, and internet protocol addresses, which do not constitute public information under section 552.002. Accordingly, any of this information within the requested documents is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to the requests.

Next, we address your comment that some of the language in the written requests for information is unclear. Specifically, you state that the requests for information are vague and ambiguous.² A governmental body is required to make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that it holds. See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). Based on our review, we find that the county has made a good-faith effort to relate the requests to information that the county maintains. Accordingly, we will address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107. 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. 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 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 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

²We note that the Act permits a governmental body to seek clarification from a requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); see also Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (providing that time periods proscribed by section 552.301 are tolled during the clarification process).

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).

You state that a portion of the requested information consists of confidential attorney-client communications between attorneys representing the county and county employees. Further, you explain that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county. Therefore, the county need not disclose the information we have marked under section 552.107.³

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. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.109 excepts from public disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held that the test to be applied to information under section 552.109 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. We will therefore consider your claims regarding common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claim under section 552.109.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy if it: (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person; and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. 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

³As our ruling is dispositive for the information at issue, we need not address your arguments under section 552.103.

organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683. Having reviewed your arguments and the remaining information, we find that none of the information at issue is protected by common-law privacy. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under either section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy or under section 552.109.

Section 552.102 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). This office has found that section 552.102 only applies to information in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. You have failed to explain how any portion of the remaining records comprise information in the personnel file of a county employee. Therefore, we determine that section 552.102 does not apply to the remaining information.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). We find that you have not explained how or why section 552.108 is applicable to the remaining information. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the information under section 552.108.

Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the attorney work product privilege found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; 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 attorney work product as consisting of

(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 governmental body that seeks to withhold information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of

litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *See id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that information was created 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.

Although, you state that a portion of the requested information is subject to section 552.111, upon review we find that the county has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information constitutes attorney work product created by the county in anticipation of litigation. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, 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 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected under 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)*. Upon review, we find that the county has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117. Therefore, no portion of the information may be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the county need not release the judicial records or the remaining information we have marked which is not subject to the Act. The county may withhold attorney client communications, which we have marked subject to section 552.107. The remaining information must be released.

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); *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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Loan Hong-Turney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LH/sdk

Ref: ID# 283049

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Gary Fusfield
P.O. Box 220
Bryson, Texas 76427
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Stephenson
2576 Squaw Mountain Road
Jacksboro, Texas 76458
(w/o enclosures)