



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 22, 2006

Ms. Laura Garza Jimenez
County Attorney
Nueces County
901 Leopard, Room 207
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3680

OR2006-05345

Dear Ms. Jimenez:

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# 249648.

The Nueces County Judge (the "county") received a request for 14 categories of information relating to paving work done by two named entities during a specified time interval. You indicate that most of the requested information will be released upon payment of estimated costs.¹ You have submitted as Exhibit 3 information that the county seeks to withhold under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code and Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Although you take no position with respect to the information submitted as Exhibit 2, you believe that it implicates the proprietary interests of Dos Logistics. You notified Dos Logistics of this request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information in question should not be released. We have considered your arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of decision, this office has received no correspondence

¹You inform us that the requestor has consented to the redaction of any account number or private citizen's e-mail address.

from Dos Logistics. Thus, there has been no demonstration that any of the information submitted as Exhibit 2 is proprietary for the purposes of the Act. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Next, we address the county's claim under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege.² 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See 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 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. *See* 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. *See 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 state that the information submitted as Exhibit 3 consists of or documents attorney-client communications that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You also state that these communications were intended to be

²We note that section 552.101, which the county also claims, does not encompass the attorney-client privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-3 (2002).

and remain confidential. Based on your representations, we conclude that the county may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the county may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The rest of the submitted information must be released.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.W. Morris, III", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 249648

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Carlos Villarreal
Hermansen, McKibben, Woolsey & Villarreal, L.L.P.
1100 Tower I
555 North Carancahua
Corpus Christi, Texas 78478
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eric Chin
Dos Logistics
2811 East Mile 9-1/2
Donna, Texas 78537
(w/o enclosures)