



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 27, 2007

Ms. Brandy Byrd Hallford  
Assistant County Attorney  
Williamson County Courthouse  
405 MLK #7  
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2007-04871

Dear Ms. Hallford:

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# 277085.

Williamson County (the "county") received a request for "the letter from or to the commissioner regarding the [T. Don Hutto facility] contract to hold federal detainees," the facility's detainee list, and the detainee list of WC jail.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that in an e-mail dated March 1, 2007, the requestor narrowed her original request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used).

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

Initially, you inform this office that the requestor narrowed her original request in an e-mail dated March 1, 2007. Additionally, you inform us that the county sought clarification from the requestor regarding which records were meant by “the letter from or to the commissioner regarding the [T. Don Hutto facility] contract to hold federal detainees.” *See Gov’t Code* § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used). In this instance, you submitted all e-mail correspondence between the county commissioner and the county attorney’s office. Upon review, we consider the county to have made a good-faith effort to identify information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the applicability of your claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

You claim that Exhibit B-1 is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with part 236 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations.<sup>3</sup> Section 236.6 of title 8 provides as follows:

No person, including any state or local government entity or any privately operated detention facility, that houses, maintain, provides, services to, or otherwise holds any detainee on behalf of the [Immigration and Naturalization] Service [(the “INS”)] (whether by contract or otherwise), and no other person who by virtue of any official or contractual relationship with such person obtains information relating to any detainee, shall disclose or otherwise permit to be made public the name of, or other information relating to, such detainee.<sup>4</sup> Such information shall be under the control of [the INS] and shall be subject to public disclosure only pursuant to the provisions of applicable federal laws, regulations and executive orders. Insofar as any documents or other records contain such information, such documents shall not be public records. This section applies to all persons and information identified or described in it, regardless of when such persons obtained such information, and applies to all requests for public disclosure of such information, including requests that are the subject of proceedings pending as of April 17, 2002.

8 C.F.R. § 236.6. You inform us that the information submitted as Exhibit B-1 “identif[ies] federal detainees being housed in the T. Don Hutto Residential Facility.” Based on your

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.101 encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. A federal statute or an administrative regulation enacted pursuant to statutory authority can provide statutory confidentiality for purposes of section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 476 (1987) (addressing statutory predecessor).

<sup>4</sup>We note that the functions of the INS were transferred to the Department of Homeland Security on March 1, 2003. *See* Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002). However, as section 236.6 still refers to the agency at issue as “the INS,” we will also do so in this ruling.

arguments and our review of the information in question, we agree that the county is required to abide by rules promulgated by the INS with regard to INS detainees. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 2.1 (providing that Secretary of Homeland Security may issue regulations to administer and enforce laws relating to immigration and naturalization of aliens); *see also American Civil Liberties Union of New Jersey, Inc. v. County of Hudson*, 799 A.2d 629 (N.J. 2002) (stating that while state possesses sovereign authority over operation of its jails, it may not operate them, in respect to INS detainees, in any way that derogates federal government's exclusive and expressed interest in regulating aliens). We therefore conclude that Exhibit B-1 is made confidential by section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations and must be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See ACLU*, 799 A.2d at 655 (concluding that because INS had authority to promulgate 8 C.F.R. § 236.6, provision preempts state law requiring disclosure of requested information); *see also English v. General Elec. Co.*, 496 U.S. 72, 79 (1990) (noting that state law is preempted to extent it actually conflicts with federal law); *Louisiana Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 369 (1986) (noting that federal agency acting within scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation).

You assert that Exhibit B-2 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. This section 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 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). 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.*, 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 inform us that Exhibit B-2 consists of confidential communications between the county commissioner and county attorneys that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You also state that the communications have remained confidential. After review of your arguments, we find you have established that Exhibit B-2 consists of privileged attorney-client communications; therefore, the county may withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold Exhibit B-1 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 236.6 of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The county may withhold Exhibit B-2 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claim.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/mcf

Ref: ID# 277085

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Patty Ruland  
2611 Bee Caves Road, #208  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)