



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 7, 2014

Mr. Guillermo Trevino  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2014-17894

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 540007 (ORR# W035891)

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for employment-related categories of information pertaining to three named code compliance officers. The city states it will withhold information under sections 552.024 and 552.147 of the Government Code, and personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> The city states it has released some of the requested information, but claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open 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 seeking a decision from this office.

sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the request for information because it was created after the city received the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release this information in response to this request.

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 exception encompasses section 182.052 of the Utilities Code, which provides, in part, the following:

(a) Except as provided by Section 182.054, a government-operated utility may not disclose personal information in a customer’s account record, or any information relating to the volume or units of utility usage or the amounts billed to or collected from the individual for utility usage, if the customer requests that the government-operated utility keep the information confidential. However, a government-operated utility may disclose information related to the customer’s volume or units of utility usage or amounts billed to or collected from the individual for utility usage if the primary source of water for such utility was a sole-source designated aquifer.

(b) A customer may request confidentiality by delivering to the government-operated utility an appropriately marked form provided under Subsection (c)(3) or any other written request for confidentiality.

Util. Code § 182.052(a)-(b). “Personal information” under section 182.052(a) means an individual’s address, telephone number, or social security number, but does not include the individual’s name. *See id.* § 182.051(4); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 625 (1994) (construing statutory predecessor). Garbage service is included in the scope of utility services covered by section 182.052. Util. Code § 182.051(3). Section 182.054 of the Utilities Code provides six exceptions to the disclosure prohibition found in section 182.052. *See id.* § 182.054.

---

<sup>2</sup>Although the city raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

<sup>3</sup>We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

You state the information you have marked under section 182.052 pertains to customers who timely requested confidentiality for their personal information, the volume or units of their utility usage, and the amounts billed to or collected from them for that utility usage. You do not indicate, and it does not otherwise appear, the exceptions to confidentiality under section 182.054 apply in this instance. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 182.052(a).

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. This office has found 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), 545 (1990). However, the public interest in a public employee's prior salary justifies disclosure, as such information bears on the employee's past employment record and suitability for the employment position in question. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 9 (1987). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, 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 conclude the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, 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. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You explain the responsive information you have marked under section 552.107 constitutes confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the responsive information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives,

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold this information.

including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

*Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

The work product doctrine under section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. 1994); *see U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). In the *Curry* decision, the Texas Supreme Court held a request for a district attorney's "entire litigation file" was "too broad" and, quoting *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case." 873 S.W.2d at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file, and a governmental body demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. ORD 647 at 5; *see Nat'l Union*, 863 S.W.2d at 461 (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes).

You contend the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 encompasses the litigation file of a city attorney concerning a pending case. We find the request at issue constitutes a request for an "entire" litigation file for purposes of the *Curry* decision. Thus, we agree the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other argument to withhold this information.

We note the remaining information includes information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup> Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court has held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). We find the city must withhold the date of birth you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides in part the following:

(a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

*Id.* § 552.136(a)-(b). We understand the city seeks to withhold employee numbers and a “notice” number in a notice of violation under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, the city has not explained how these types of numbers consist of an access device number used to obtain money, goods, services, or any item of value, or used to initiate the transfer of funds. *See id.* §§ 552.136(a), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, the city has failed to demonstrate the

---

<sup>6</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.102 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions.

applicability of section 552.136 to any of the remaining information and may not withhold it on that ground.

To conclude, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 182.052(a) of the Utilities Code and the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the responsive information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the remaining information marked under sections 552.102 and 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information.

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](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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/cbz

Ref: ID# 540007

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)