



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2011

Ms. Meredith R. Riede
Assistant City Attorney
City of Bryan
P.O. Box 1000
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2011-12380

Dear Ms. Riede:

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# 428111.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to fire, police, or code violations and complaints regarding a specified address. You indicate the city does not have any information responsive to the request for fire violations. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code 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). 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). You state that the information submitted as Exhibit B relates to fifteen pending criminal prosecutions. Based upon this representation, we conclude that release of the information at issue 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) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we conclude that section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibit B.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the information submitted as Exhibit C relates to a concluded case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations, we conclude section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to Exhibit C.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). The city must release basic information, including detailed descriptions of the offenses, even if this information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects 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. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The 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.” *See Open Records Decision No.* 279 at 2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). 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. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer's identity. *See Open Records Decision No.* 549 at 5 (1990).

¹As our ruling is dispositive for Exhibits B and C, we do not address your remaining claims against disclosure for this information, except to note that basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

You state some of the information in Exhibit D reveals the identity of an individual who reported possible violations of the city's code of ordinances to the city's Code Enforcement Department, which we understand has the authority to enforce the violations at issue. You also state that such violations are Class C misdemeanors and carry criminal penalties. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that the city may withhold the identifying information of the informer in Exhibit D, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, the remaining information in Exhibit D does not identify the informer and, thus, may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 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). 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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 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 assert the e-mails submitted as Exhibit E constitute communications between city staff and city attorneys that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city. You also assert these communications were made in confidence and have maintained their confidentiality. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege Exhibit E, which the city may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit B from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city may withhold Exhibit E under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 428111

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)