



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 16, 2011

Ms. Jenny Gravley
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2011-18546

Dear Ms. Gravley:

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# 439170.

The City of Haltom City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for eight categories of information related to text messages, e-mails, and telephone calls to and from four named individuals during two specified time periods. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.122 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state the city notified the third party of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.¹

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.

Initially, you assert that the requestor's request for information has been withdrawn by operation of law because the requestor has failed to respond to the itemized cost estimate for copies of the requested information. Under section 552.2615 of the Government Code, a governmental body is required to provide a requestor with an estimate of charges when a request to inspect a paper record will result in the imposition of a charge that will exceed forty dollars. *See Gov't Code § 552.2615.* The relevant portion of section 552.2615 provides:

(a) . . . the governmental body must inform the requestor of the responsibilities imposed on the requestor by this section and of the rights granted by this entire section and give the requestor the information needed to respond, including:

(1) that the requestor must provide the governmental body with a mailing, facsimile transmission, or electronic mail address to receive the itemized statement and that it is the requestor's choice which type of address to provide;

(2) that the request is considered automatically withdrawn if the requestor does not respond in writing to the itemized statement and any updated itemized statement in the time and manner required by this section; and

(3) that the requestor may respond to the statement by delivering the written response to the governmental body by mail, in person, by facsimile transmission if the governmental body is capable of receiving documents transmitted in that manner, or by electronic mail if the governmental body has an electronic mail address.

(b) A request . . . is considered to have been withdrawn by the requestor if the requestor does not respond in writing to the itemized statement by informing the governmental body within 10 business days after the date the statement is sent to the requestor that

(1) the requestor will accept the estimated charge;

(2) the requestor is modifying the request in response to the itemized statement; or

(3) the requestor has sent to the attorney general a complaint alleging that the requestor has been overcharged for being provided with a copy of the public information.

Id. § 552.2615(a), (b). You provide documentation showing you provided the requestor with an itemized cost estimate for information responsive to the request. However, we have examined the cost estimate at issue and have determined it does not comply with the provisions of section 552.2615. Specifically, the estimate did not inform the requestor that inspection of the records would be a less costly method of obtaining the information. *See id.* § 552.2615(a). Accordingly, we conclude the requestor's public information request has not been withdrawn by operation of law, and we will address your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, no third party has submitted to this office reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Thus, no third party has provided us with a basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that a third party may have in this information.

Next, we address your assertion that the city has no information responsive to categories one through six of the request because the city does not provide or fund telephone or e-mail services to the named individuals. The Act is applicable to "public information." *See Gov't Code* § 552.021. Section 552.002 of the Act provides that "public information" consists of "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it." *Id.* § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and, thus, is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see Open Records Decision Nos.* 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body, and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. *Gov't Code* § 552.002(a)(2); *see Open Records Decision No.* 462 at 4 (1987). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See Gov't Code* § 552.001(a).

We further note the characterization of information as “public information” under the Act is not dependent on whether the requested records are in the possession of an individual or whether a governmental body has a particular policy or procedure that establishes a governmental body’s access to the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 3-4 (1995) (finding that information does not fall outside definition of “public information” in Act merely because individual member of governmental body possesses information rather than governmental body as whole); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 425 (1985) (concluding, among other things, that information sent to individual school trustees’ homes was public information because it related to official business of governmental body) (overruled on other grounds by Open Records Decision No. 439 (1986)). Furthermore, this office has found information in a public official’s personal e-mail account and home telephone records may be subject to the Act where the public official uses the personal e-mail account and home telephone to conduct public business. *See* ORD 635 at 6-7 (appointment calendar owned by a public official or employee is subject to the Act when it is maintained by another public employee and used for public business). Therefore, any such information that is subject to the Act must be released unless it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302. As you have not raised any exception to disclosure of this information, it must be released to the extent it existed on the date the city received the request.

We next note the city did not fully comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code. Section 552.301(b) requires a governmental body requesting an open records ruling from this office to “ask for the attorney general’s decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the tenth business-day after the date of receiving the written request.” *Id.* § 552.301(b). While the city raised sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code within the ten-business-day time period as required by subsection 552.301(b), the city did not raise section 552.122 of the Government Code until after the ten-business-day deadline had passed. Consequently, we determine the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 as to its section 552.122 claim.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 (1994), 586 (1991), 319 (1982). This office has held a compelling reason exists to withhold information when third party interests are at stake or when information is made confidential by another source of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (construing predecessor statute). Section 552.122 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body’s interests and may be waived.

Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Because the city failed to comply with section 552.301, it has waived its claim under section 552.122. We will, however, address your timely-raised claims.

You seek to withhold portions of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in part the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation representing, that prior to your receipt of the instant request, a notice of appeal in Cause No. 141-249217-10 was filed by the requestor and is currently pending in the 141st District Court of Tarrant County, Texas. Based on this representation and our review, we agree litigation to which the city is a party was pending on the date the city received the present request. You also state the information at issue relates to the pending litigation because it concerns the indefinite suspension of the requestor's client. Based on this representation and our review, we find the information at

issue is related to the pending litigation. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

In reaching this conclusion, we assume the opposing parties in the pending and anticipated litigation have not already seen or had access to any of the remaining information. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. If the opposing parties have seen or had access to information relating to litigation, through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See 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, 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). 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

²As we make this determination, we need not address your remaining claims against disclosure of this information.

time the information was communicated. See *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 state the marked e-mails in the remaining records are communications between city attorneys and city staff. You have identified the parties to the communications. You state these communications were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city, were intended to be confidential, and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the marked information. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked in the remaining records under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You claim some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. 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 demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82.

The type of information considered intimate or 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. This office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses to be excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). This office also has found that information that reflects an individual’s personal financial decisions and is not related to a financial transaction between the individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, we determine the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information you have marked

is not highly intimate or embarrassing and a matter of no legitimate public concern. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold that information on privacy grounds under section 552.101.

Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Occ. Code §§ 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). You generally assert the remaining information is subject to the MPA. Upon review, however, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information constitutes a medical record for purposes of the MPA. Therefore, none of the remaining information is confidential under the MPA, and no portion of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the address affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

Finally, you assert some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies

of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1978). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, to the extent a city employee or official used a personal e-mail account, home telephone, or personal cellular telephone to generate information to generate information related to the transaction of public business, that information is public information subject to release under the Act. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city also may withhold the marked information in the remaining records under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, and (2) the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the address affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 439170

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Cooperative Personnel Services
d/b/a CPS Human Resource Services
241 Lathrop Way
Sacramento, California 95815
(w/o enclosures)