



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2004

Mr. James G. Nolan
Senior Attorney
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services
P.O. Box 149030
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2004-0785

Dear Mr. Nolan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 195525.

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the "department") received a request for seven categories of information related to a specified contract.¹ You state that the department will make most of the requested information available to the requestor. However, you claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.² We have also considered comments submitted to this office by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address the comments submitted to this office by the requestor. The requestor asserts that, in response to her previous requests for information, the department "did not produce all records as requested or that were subject to the (earlier) requests, but instead

¹As of February 1, 2004, the Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services is now called the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services.

²We note that chapter 552 of the Government Code does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request for information. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). In this instance, we have marked the documents that were created after the date of the department's receipt of this request. Thus, this information is not responsive to the request for information, and we need not address the applicability of the Public Information Act (the "Act") to it.

substituted their analysis or interpretation without applying to the Office of the Attorney General for a decision.” Specifically, the requestor claims that the records the department now seeks to withhold were in existence at the time of the previous requests and should have been released at that time. The Public Information Act requires a governmental body to release only information that it believes to be responsive to a request. However, in determining whether information is responsive, a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate the request to information that it holds. Open Records Decision No. 590 at 1 n. 1 (1991). In this instance, the department indicates that it released the information it deemed responsive to the requestor’s previous requests for information. Whether the information the department has submitted to this office as responsive to the current request for information was responsive to the requestor’s previous requests for information is a question of fact. This office cannot resolve disputes of fact in its decisional process. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 2 (1991), 552 at 4 (1990), 435 at 4 (1986). Where fact issues are not resolvable as a matter of law, we must rely on the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our decision, or upon those facts that are discernible from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 4 (1990). Accordingly, we must accept the department’s representation that it released all documents it deemed responsive to the requestor’s previous requests for information, and that the information submitted to this office as responsive to the current request for information was not responsive to the previous requests for information.

Next, we will address the department’s arguments in regard to the submitted responsive information. 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. 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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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 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 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). 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, no writ). 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 explain that the responsive information consists of confidential communications between the department and its attorneys. Upon review of your arguments and the responsive information, we conclude that the submitted responsive information is protected by the attorney-client privilege, and thus, may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general’s Open Government Hotline, toll free,

at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 195525

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Penelope M. Cowan
President
Accor, Inc.
5121 Bee Cave Road, Suite 207
Austin, Texas 78746-5216
(w/o enclosures)