ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 8, 2005

Mr. Jeffrey L. Moore
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2005-10108

Dear Mr. Moore:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 235945.

The City of Highland Village (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests for documents related to the City Secretary's certification with the International Institute of Municipal Clerks; employment contract with the city; salary information; and documents pertaining to the City Secretary's alleged misuse of a city credit card. You state that you have released some of the responsive information to the requestors, but claim that the submitted information in Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107 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 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 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)-(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).

In this instance, you inform us that the documents you have marked under section 552.107 are communications between the city attorney, city manager, and city employees. You explain that confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information for which you claim section 552.107 consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the city may withhold.

Section 552.117 excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). However, information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the current or former employee made the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 after the request for information was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is received by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). You state that the employees whose information is at issue elected to keep their home addresses, phone numbers, and social security numbers confidential prior to the date on which the city received this request. Accordingly, you must withhold the information you have marked in the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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." Gov't Code § 552.136. Therefore, the city must withhold the information it has marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

You also raise section 552.137 of the Government Code for e-mail addresses in the remaining submitted information. Section 552.137 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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to the work e-mail addresses of officers or employees of a governmental body. The e-mail addresses you have marked do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). In addition, you inform us that the city has not received consent for the release of the e-mail addresses at issue. Therefore, the city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.137.

In summary, the city may withhold the information it seeks to withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information it has marked pursuant to sections 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,

Lisa V. Cubriel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LVC/sgh

Ref: ID# 235945

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jay Parsons
The Dallas Morning News
131 West Main Street
Lewisville, Texas 75067
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Weir
The News Connection
2340 F.M. 407, Suite 102
Highland Village, Texas 75077
(w/o enclosures)