



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 15, 2008

Lt. William Ryan
Pharr Police Department
1900 South Cage
Pharr, Texas 78577-6751

OR2008-00733

Dear Lt. Ryan:

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# 299601.

The Pharr Police Department (the "department") received a request for all incoming and outgoing calls, text messages, and e-mails for two named individuals from June 2007 to October 22, 2007. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We also understand you to claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ You indicate that a portion of the submitted information constitutes confidential law enforcement records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (the "FBI"). Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This office has repeatedly held that the transfer of confidential information between governmental agencies does not destroy the confidentiality of that information. Attorney General Opinions

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.

H-917 (1976), H-836 (1974), Open Records Decision Nos. 561 (1990), 414 (1984), 388 (1983), 272 (1981), 183 (1978). These opinions recognize the need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between state agencies. In Open Records Decision No. 561 we considered whether the same rule applied regarding information deemed confidential by a federal agency. In that decision, we noted the general rule that the federal Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) applies only to federal agencies and does not apply to records held by state agencies. Open Records Decision No. 561 at 6. Further, we stated that information is not confidential when in the hands of a Texas agency simply because the same information is confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *Id.* However, in the interests of comity between state and federal authorities and to ensure the flow of information from federal agencies to Texas governmental bodies, we concluded that: “when information in the possession of a federal agency is ‘deemed confidential’ by federal law, such confidentiality is not destroyed by the sharing of the information with a governmental body in Texas. In such an instance, [section 552.101] requires a local government to respect the confidentiality imposed on the information by federal law.” *Id.* at 7. You state that a portion of the submitted information consists of “law enforcement sensitive matters” of the FBI that was shared with the department. To the extent the FBI deems the information confidential under FOIA, we conclude that the information submitted to the department by the FBI must be withheld under section 552.101 and federal law. To the extent the FBI does not consider the information confidential under FOIA, we concluded that the information received by the FBI must be released.

Section 552.102 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*, 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* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Act. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 550 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.) (citing *Indus. Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976)). Accordingly, we will consider your common-law privacy claim under both sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code.

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.*, 540 S.W.2d 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 organs. *Id.* at 683. Generally, however, the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees, and information that pertains to an employee’s actions

as a public servant generally cannot be considered beyond the realm of legitimate public interest, especially those who work in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern); 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review of the submitted information you have labeled "Personnel," we find that a portion of it must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We have marked the information that must be withheld on this basis. However, we determine that the remaining information at issue is either not intimate or embarrassing or is of a legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under the doctrine of common-law privacy.

Next, you claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code, which 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)-(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).

You state that a portion of the marked information contains e-mails from your city attorney to the chief of police. We note, however, that you have failed to identify any of the parties to the communications or explain their relationship with the department. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made; this office cannot necessarily assume that communication was made only among categories of individuals identified in rule 503). However, upon review, we have been able to discern that certain individuals are privileged parties. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we determine that the department has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining information constitutes attorney-client communications and thus none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.107.

You further claim that a portion of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under 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] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1). 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 id.* §§ 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 some of the submitted information relates to pending criminal investigations. 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). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 187; Open Records Decision No. 127 (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). With the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information you state relates to pending investigations in the submitted documents and CD under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Next, we note that some of the submitted information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.² Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and home telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests 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). Therefore, the department may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the employee timely elected to keep her personal information confidential, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The department may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and home telephone numbers, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code or complies with section 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). This section applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Therefore, to the extent the information we have marked pertains to a peace officer employed by the department, this information must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2).

We note that the remaining information includes personal e-mail addresses that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.137 (a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137 (c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137 (c). We have marked the types of e-mail addresses that the department must withhold under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of these e-mail addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.

In summary, to the extent the FBI deems the information it has shared with the department confidential under FOIA, we conclude that this information must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information that must be released, the department may withhold the information it seeks to withhold under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked if section 552.117 is applicable. The types of email addresses we have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code. 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jessica J. Maloney', with a long, wavy horizontal line extending to the right.

Jessica J. Maloney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJM/jh

Ref: ID# 299601

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jose M. Soto
2816 Quince
McAllen, Texas 78501
(w/o enclosures)