



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 5, 2014

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for the City of Southlake
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2014-09633

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 523577.

The Southlake Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for a specified internal affairs investigation and all communications involving five named individuals related to the internal affairs investigation during a specified time period.¹ You state the department will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You also state the department will withhold

¹You inform us the requestor modified his request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request). *See also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).³ You claim 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 information.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You contend the information in Exhibit B pertains to an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect and falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 261.001 (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). Based upon your representations and our review, we find the information we have marked and indicated is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, we conclude the information we have marked and indicated is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, we note the remaining information at issue relates to an administrative investigation by the department of a police

³Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, we note the requestor has a right of access to his own personal e-mail address under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b) (personal e-mail address of member of public may be disclosed if owner of address affirmatively consents to its disclosure).

officer. We find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue consists of a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect of a child made under chapter 261 of the Family Code, or how this information was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. Accordingly, we conclude the department may not withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and that does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). You inform us the remaining information in Exhibit B pertains to a criminal investigation conducted by the city's police department that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. However, the information at issue reflects it was generated as part of an internal investigation conducted by the department that was purely administrative in nature. You do not provide any arguments explaining how the internal investigation resulted in a criminal investigation or prosecution. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to the remaining information in Exhibit B, and the department may not withhold this information on that basis.

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 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)(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. *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 claim Exhibit C is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving the department, the department’s attorneys, and the department’s attorney representatives that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You state these communications 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 information at issue. Thus, the department may generally withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the department may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has found that common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See*

Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Upon review, we find the information we have marked and indicated meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked and indicated pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The department may generally withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the department may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails we have marked if they are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The department must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.⁴

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

⁴We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles).

Ref: ID# 523577

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)