



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 7, 2011

Ms. Zeera Angadicheril
Office of General Counsel
University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2011-00420

Dear Ms. Angadicheril:

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# 405306.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received a request for specified categories of information, including information pertaining to communications involving the requestor and police records pertaining to two named individuals. You inform us some of the requested information was the subject of previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2009-09406 (2009) and 2009-12687 (2009), and you will withhold or release that information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have 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 understand the university is releasing some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act or excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.130 of the

Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

You assert some of the requested e-mails "were not collected, assembled or maintained in connection with the transaction of any [u]niversity business, nor were they collected, assembled, or maintained pursuant to any law or ordinance." Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we agree the e-mails at issue are purely personal, and thus do 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 university. *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). Accordingly, we conclude the information you have marked is not subject to the Act and the university is not required to release it under the Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. The requestor asks for all information held by the university concerning two named individuals. However, you have not submitted documents that list either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant; therefore, the submitted information is not confidential in its entirety under common-law privacy, and the university may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

You assert some of this information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure information concerning an

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. You state the information you have marked under section 552.108 pertains to cases that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, we agree the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is protected by common-law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Common-law privacy encompasses the specific types of information that are held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has determined that other types of information also are private under section 552.101. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has held to be private). We have marked information that is highly intimate or embarrassing and not a matter of legitimate public interest. Thus, the university must withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5; *see Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985). After review of the submitted information, we find it does not contain information that is confidential under constitutional privacy; therefore, the university may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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 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). 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). 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.*, 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 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 explain the e-mails you have marked under section 552.107 constitute confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the university that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the university. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree this information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications; therefore, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107.

You assert some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2* (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2* (1990).

In *Open Records Decision No. 615*, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v.*

Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. See ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state that the information you have marked under section 552.111 consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations reflecting the policymaking processes of the university with respect to its compensation plan. Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we find that the university has established the applicability of section 552.111 of the Government Code to some of the information you marked. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111. However, we find you have not established the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations, or it is purely factual information; therefore, the university may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 on that ground.


To conclude, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university may withhold the information you have marked under sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code and the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information.

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 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tf

Ref: ID# 405306

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)