ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 22, 2013

Mr. Dick H. Gregg, III
Gregg & Gregg, P.C.
16055 Space Center Boulevard, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77062

OR2013-04758

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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# 482066.

The City of Kemah (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information to or from named city officials regarding specified individuals and subject matters from a specified period of time.[1] You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[2] We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See*

[1]We note the city sought and received clarification from the requestor regarding the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

[2]We 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.

Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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, 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, *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. *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 raise section 552.107(1) of the Government Code for Exhibit F. You state the information at issue consists of attorney-client communications that were made between outside counsel for the city, city employees, and city council members for the purpose of rendering professional legal services to city. You state these communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Exhibit F. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) 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. You raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for Exhibit G. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 ("Privacy Rule"); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *Id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act "is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public." *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep't of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.): ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information on that basis.

You claim Exhibit G is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108 provides, in relevant part:

> (a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:
>
> > (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]
> >
> > . . .

> (b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:
>
> > (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information, the release of which would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Section 552.108(b)(1) protects internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with ongoing law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that a specified e-mail in Exhibit G pertains to a pending criminal investigation by the Kemah Police Department. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that release of this information, which we have marked, 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 the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit G under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.[3] However, you do not explain how release of the remaining documents in Exhibit G would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime or with law enforcement or prosecutorial efforts in general. Accordingly, the remaining information in Exhibit G may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. This section makes confidential L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms required by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education ("TCLEOSE"). Section 1701.306 provides, in part:

> (a) [TCLEOSE] may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:
>
> > (1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and

---

[3]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

> emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and
>
> (2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a physical examination, blood test, or other medical test.
>
> (b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCLEOSE]. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a), (b). The city must withhold the L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms we have marked in Exhibit G under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.[4]

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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. The type of information considered intimate and 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 that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit

---

[4]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information. We further note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including L-2 and L-3 declarations under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.

history), 455 at 9 (1987) (employment applicant's salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Additionally, 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) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Moreover, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, information that relates to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system is not protected by privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). Upon review, we find the information we have marked in Exhibit G is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information in Exhibit G is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information in Exhibit G under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.[5] *Id.* §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. To the extent the employee concerned timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit G under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the employee did not make a timely election, the city may not withhold the marked information on this basis.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit G under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit G under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction

---

[5]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code and common-law privacy. To the extent the employee concerned timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit G under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information in Exhibit G must be released.[6]

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,

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 482066

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

---

[6]We note the remaining information contains social security numbers. 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. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).