



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 18, 2008

Mr. Scott Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A&M System  
A&M System Building, Suite 2079  
200 Technology Way  
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2008-08384

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 313222.

Tarleton State University (the "university") received a request for information regarding a former university employee.<sup>1</sup> You state that you will release some information to the requestor. You also state that you will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you indicate that some of the requested information was the subject of two previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2008-00814 (2008) and 2008-07983 (2008). With regard to information in the current request that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed, you must continue to rely on Open Records Letter

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the university sought and received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We will address your arguments for the submitted information that was not the subject of these prior rulings.

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 information protected by other statutes. This office has stated that the regulations found at part 603 of title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations send a clear message that "claim information" in the files of a state unemployment compensation agency is to be disclosed only to a "receiving agency," as defined in the regulations, or to other specified parties. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 603.1 *et seq.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 476 at 4 (1987). Otherwise, pursuant to section 603.7 of title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, state unemployment compensation agencies must protect the confidentiality of claim information. The confidentiality provision of section 603.7 applies to "state unemployment compensation agencies" and "requesting agencies." *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 603.7, 603.2. You do not demonstrate how this provision is applicable to the university. Thus, the information at issue in Exhibit D may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 603.7 of title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by common-law privacy. 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). *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. We will therefore consider your claims regarding sections 552.101 and 552.102 together.

In this instance, the information at issue pertains to a university employee. As this office has often stated, information that relates to public employment and public employees is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Nevertheless, personal financial information relating to a public employee may be protected by common-law privacy. This office has determined that financial information that relates only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (identifying public and private portions of certain state personnel records), 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial

information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). Thus, a public employee's allocation of part of the employee's salary to a voluntary investment program offered by the employer is a personal investment decision, and information about that decision is protected by common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5 (1990) (deferred compensation plan).

Upon review, we agree that the university must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under sections 552.101 and 552.102 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We find, however, that you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information in Exhibit D is either intimate or embarrassing or is not of a legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 or section 552.102 of the Government Code.

Next, you argue that Exhibit E is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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 contend that the information in Exhibit E consists of or documents communications between university personnel and the university's general counsel made for the purpose of rendering professional legal services to the university. You state that these communications were intended to be confidential, and that confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that most of the information in Exhibit E is protected by the attorney-client privilege. However, we determine that the university has failed to demonstrate that the remaining information at issue constitutes or documents confidential communications between privileged parties for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, except for the information we have marked for release, the university may withhold Exhibit E pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for Exhibit C. 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.” 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), 301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. You state that Exhibit C relates to an ongoing investigation and prosecution being conducted by the university’s police department. You also state, and provide documentation showing, that the Attorney General objects to release of the information at issue under section 552.108 because its release would interfere with an ongoing criminal prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of Exhibit C 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).

We note, however, that 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). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88. Thus, the university must release basic information, including a detailed description of the offense, even if the information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. See Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). The university may withhold the rest of Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1).

In summary, to the extent the information at issue in the present request is identical to the information addressed in Open Records Letter Nos. 2008-00814 and 2008-07983, the university must withhold or release the information in accordance with these rulings. The university must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under sections 552.101 and 552.102 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Except for the information we have marked for release, the university may withhold Exhibit E pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the university may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The remaining 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/jb

Ref: ID# 313222

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. D'Leesa Keys  
1191 West Vanderbilt Street, Apt. 139  
Stephenville, Texas 76401  
(w/o enclosures)