



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 23, 2014

Ms. Nneka Kanu
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2014-16911

Dear Ms. Kanu:

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# 537060.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for all documents, e-mails, letters, and inspection reports related to a violation of the Non-Smoking Ordinance at a specified address. You state the city will redact e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You state some of the responsive information will be released. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

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 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 information in Exhibit 4 contains correspondence sent to, from, and among city attorneys and various city employees in their capacity as clients and client representatives. You state all of the communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state the communications were not intended for third parties, and the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Exhibit 4. Thus, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit 4 in its entirety 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by the common-law informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *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 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 ORD 549 at 5. However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege.

You state the information you have marked in Exhibit 3 identifies an individual who reported possible violations of chapter 21, Article IX, section 21-237 and 21-238 of the city's Code of Ordinances to the city's Health and Human Services Department, which has the authority to enforce these provisions of the city's Code. You inform us a violation of these ordinances is a misdemeanor punishable by fine. You also state the subject of the complaint does not already know the identity of the informer. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information you have marked in Exhibit 3. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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. See *id.* at 681-82. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we marked in Exhibit 2 satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit 4 pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit 3 pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's

privilege. The city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 2 pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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.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,



Ellen Webking
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EW/ac

Ref: ID# 537060

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)