



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 25, 2014

Ms. Danielle Folsom  
Assistant City Attorney  
Legal Department  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 368  
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2014-21484

Dear Ms. Folsom:

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# 542627 (GC No. 21704).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for a specified investigation conducted by the city's Office of the Inspector General ("OIG"), including the charges filed and witness statements. You claim the submitted information is privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your claims and reviewed the submitted information.

You acknowledge the submitted information consists of completed investigations by the city's OIG that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). You claim the information is privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your claim under rule 503. We note portions of the

information are subject to sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Because sections 552.101 and 552.117 make information confidential under the Act, we will also consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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).

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. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). See *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You inform us the submitted information consists of OIG investigative files and contains communications between employees of the OIG in their capacity as attorneys and attorney representatives, and city employees in their capacities as clients and client representatives. You state the OIG is a division of the city attorney's office and acts under the city attorney's supervision. You also state the communications were made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You assert the communications were intended to be confidential and that confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established most of the submitted information is protected by the attorney-client privilege. See *Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney's entire investigative report protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, the remaining information consists of communications with individuals you have not demonstrated are privileged parties. Therefore, this information is not privileged under rule 503 and the city may not withhold it on this basis.

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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Furthermore, in *Morales v. Ellen*, the court determined the identities of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment in the workplace are highly intimate and embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. See 840 S.W.3d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied). Upon review, we find the information we marked in the remaining information 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 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for the information is made.

Ref: ID# 542627

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was made. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Lauren Dahlstein  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LMD/som

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that 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 requests information concerning himself). Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.