



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 7, 2014

Mr. Jerry E. Drake, Jr.
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2014-20325

Dear Mr. Drake:

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# 541120.

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for information relating to a specified incident, including the incident report, the incident photos, and all internal affairs files. You state you have released some responsive information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a jailer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, 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. We understand a TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to jailers

¹ Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

for identification in TCOLE's electronic database and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Accordingly, we find the jailer's TCOLE identification number in the submitted information does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the TCOLE identification number is not subject to the Act and need not be released 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:

(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 pertains to a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the information at issue 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 you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the 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 assertion of the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Furthermore, because information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 of the Government Code. In addition, we note portions of the information are subject to sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code. Because these sections make information confidential under the Act, we will consider their applicability to the information at issue.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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*

(2002). 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. 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 privileged 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, 425 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and 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 (Tex. 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 state the submitted information relates to an ongoing criminal investigation by the Texas Rangers. However, you have not provided our office with a representation from the Texas Rangers objecting to the release of the information at issue. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on behalf of the Texas Rangers pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We note the submitted information contains a Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) number subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code.² Section 552.101 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 encompasses laws that make criminal history record information (“CHRI”) confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* at 10–12. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for criminal justice purposes. *See id.* § 411.089(b)(1). The submitted information contains an FBI number that constitutes CHRI generated by the FBI. Accordingly, we find the FBI number we have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.³

The submitted information contains information subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) 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. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³We note an individual may obtain his own CHRI from DPS. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(b)(3).

The submitted information contains information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, then the city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the city must withhold (1) the FBI number we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law; and (2) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Additionally, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.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

⁴We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body to provide him with information concerning himself). Therefore, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, it must again seek a ruling from our office.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Berggr", written over the printed name.

Brian E. Berggr
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/ac

Ref: ID# 541120

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)