



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 4, 2010

Ms. Kelley Messer
Assistant City Attorney
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2010-00024

Dear Ms. Messer:

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# 366301.

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for all information regarding the dangerous dog investigation of the requestor's pet. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information does not pertain to the dangerous dog investigation, as specified in the request. Thus, this information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the request. This decision does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, and that information need not be released.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 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). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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, 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 pet.). 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 the information at issue consists of a memorandum from the city’s Animal Services Department to the city’s legal department. You state that this communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of legal services, and you inform this office that this communication has remained confidential. Based on your representation and our review, we agree the memorandum constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication. Therefore, the city may withhold this document, which we have marked, under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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 common-law informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law

enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege. The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer’s identity. Open Records Decision 549 at 5 (1990).

In this instance, you state that portions of the information at issue reveal the identity of individuals who reported stray dogs to the city’s Animal Services Department. You also state that the dogs’ owner received criminal citations for each animal running loose. Thus, based on your representations and our review, we conclude that the city may withhold the information identifying the original informers, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city’s animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer’s privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). The city, however, has failed to demonstrate that the informer’s privilege is applicable to any of the remaining information. Thus, we conclude that the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the city may withhold the memorandum we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information related to the identities of informers we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege. The remaining information must be released.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public

¹We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Gov’t Code § 552.023 (person or person’s authorized representative has a special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests). Because such information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mack T. Harrison", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/rl

Ref: ID# 366301

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)