



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 14, 2014

Ms. Cynthia Trevino
Counsel for the City of Garden Ridge
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C.
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2014-18319

Dear Ms. 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# 539465 (Ref. No. 2014-32).

The City of Garden Ridge (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents concerning complaints against the requestor. The city states it has released some of the requested information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.117 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.¹ We have considered the city's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a peace officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("commission") identification number.² In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes,

¹Although the city raises section 552.1175, we note section 552.117 is the correct exception to raise for information the city holds in its capacity as employer. Additionally, although the city raises section 552.103 of the Government Code, it makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education was renamed the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement by the 83rd Legislature. *See* Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., ch. 93, § 1.01, 2013 Tex. Gen. Laws 174, 174.

documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. ORD 581 at 5. We understand an officer's commission identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in the commissioner's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the commission's website. Accordingly, we find the officer's commission identification number in the submitted information does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the commission identification number is not subject to the Act and the city is not required to release it to the requestor.

Next, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city raises section 552.107 of the Government Code for this information, this exception is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1)), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions).* Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the city's assertions of the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, respectively. Additionally, the city raises sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code for the submitted information, which make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, we will also consider the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is 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).

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* ORD 676 at 6-7. Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *Id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege extends to entire communication, including factual information).

The city states the information it has marked consists of communications involving city attorneys and employees. The city states the communications were made for the purpose of

facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has established the information we have marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.³ However, we find the city has not demonstrated the remaining information at issue reveals privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue on that basis.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank 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. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

The city argues the information it has marked consists of privileged attorney work product. Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold the information it has marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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 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 concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, we note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984). Upon review, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁴ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

⁴Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found in article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

In summary, the commission identification number is not subject to the Act and the city is not required to release it to the requestor. The city may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining 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, 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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 539465

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)