



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 2, 2016

Mr. Jonathan L. Almanza
Assistant District Attorney
County of Hidalgo
100 North Closner, Room 303
Edinburg, Texas 78539

OR2016-17271

Dear Mr. Almanza:

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# 621371 (Hidalgo Reference No. 2016-0060-DA.CO).

Hidalgo County (the "county") received two requests from the same requestor for (1) the personnel file of a named individual, (2) communications relating to the named individual or the Community Service Agency for a specified time period, and (3) communications between two named individuals for a specified time period. You state the county will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.107 of the Government Code.¹

¹Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception 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. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court expressly disagreed with Hubert’s interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Therefore, the county must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.³ However, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.102.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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 concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is

²We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 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). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision 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), 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Furthermore, information pertaining to leave of public employees is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 at 2 (1982) (names of employees taking sick leave and dates of sick leave taken not private).

Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the county has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

The county states the information in Exhibit E consists of communications involving county attorneys, county representatives, and other county employees and officials. The county states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the county has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the county may withhold the information in Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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 or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.⁴ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). 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 or official 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. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. To the extent the individual at issue timely requested

⁴The 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).

confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the county may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if a governmental body did not pay for the service. To the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the county may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or 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. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the county must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we find the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The county may withhold the information in Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the county may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if a governmental body did not pay for the service. The county must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 621371

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)