



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 21, 2016

Ms. Julie Pandya Doshier
Counsel for the City of Farmers Branch
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2016-14066

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 614989 (Ref No. 76423).

The Farmers Branch Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for all department policies and procedures, all e-mails sent to or from department employees regarding a specified incident, and all training materials and policies used to train department employees. You state you will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108,

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

552.111, 552.1175, and 552.137 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note the department asked the requestor to clarify portions of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). We understand the department has not received a response to the request for clarification. Thus, the department is not required to release information in response to the portions of the request for which it sought, but did not receive, clarification. However, if the requestor clarifies or narrows these portions of the request for information, then the department must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387.

Next, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-12716 (2016). In that ruling, we determined, in part, the City of Farmers Branch (the "city") must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, for the submitted information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-12716 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). We will address your arguments against the disclosure of the remaining information that was not subject to the prior ruling.

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

²Although you claim section 552.117 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.1175 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the department does not hold the submitted information in an employment capacity.

³We 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.

Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, which reads as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). The information at issue involves juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). It does not appear any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.⁴ However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information involves juvenile conduct for purposes of section 58.007 of the Family Code. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

You state, and provide documentation showing, simultaneously with the department's receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Henriquez v. Farmers Branch*, Case 13:16-CV-00868-M, was filed and is currently pending against the city in the United States District Court, Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the department received the present request for information. You also state the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on your representations and our review, we find the remaining information you marked is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the department may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁵

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982).* Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).*

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. 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. *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 a 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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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. *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 that 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 a portion of the remaining information, which you marked, consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and department employees. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information you marked. Accordingly, the department may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

- (1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and
- (2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(1), (b). We note section 552.1175 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Some of the remaining information, which we marked, relates to an officer of the department but the information is not held by the department in an employment capacity. Accordingly, to the extent the officer at issue elects to restrict access to his marked information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the department must withhold the marked information that pertains to the officer under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, if the officer at issue does not elect to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information pertaining to the officer may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the department must withhold the personal e-mail address you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.⁶

In summary, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-12716 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The department may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.103 of

⁶We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

the Government Code. The department may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the officer at issue elects to restrict access to his marked information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the department must withhold the marked information that pertains to the officer under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The department must withhold the personal e-mail address you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The department 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,



Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 614989

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)