



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 12, 2007

Mr. Brett Norbraten  
Open Records Attorney  
Department of Aging and Disability Services  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2007-07385

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 280786.

The Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received a request for a copy of the Columbus Organization's audit of the Lubbock State School. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we address the requestor's contention that the report at issue is a completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1). *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1) (stating that a completed report is public information unless made confidential by section 552.108 of the Government Code or other law). Although the requestor contends that the report at issue consists of a completed report made for the department by a third party consultant, the department represents to this office that the attached report exists only as the incomplete draft that is attached to the submitted communications. The department also informs this office that the department does not maintain the attached report elsewhere in completed form. This office is unable to make factual determinations or resolve factual disputes in the ruling process. *See* Attorney General Opinions GA-0087 at 1 (2003), GA-0003 at 1 n. 2 (2003), JC-0534 at 1 (2002) (this office does not make factual determinations in opinion process). Where a fact

issue cannot be resolved as a matter of law, we must rely on the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our opinion, or upon those facts that are discernible from the responsive documents submitted for our inspection. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 4 (1990). Upon review of the department's representations to this office and the submitted information, we are unable to determine as a matter of law that the report at issue is a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Thus, we will address the department's arguments pertaining to the submitted 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 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). 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.* 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 case, the submitted information consists of e-mail communications, with attachments, made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. The department explains that the communications were between clients, client representatives, lawyers, and third party consultants identified by the department, and were intended to be confidential. Finally, you state that the department has maintained the confidentiality of

these communications. Thus, you may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 "Justin D. Gordon". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "J" and "G".

Justin D. Gordon  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JDG/eeg

Ref: ID# 280786

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joseph R. Larson  
Ogden, Gibson, Brooks & Longoria, LLP  
1900 Pennzoil South Tower  
711 Louisiana  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Terri Langford  
Houston Chronicle  
c/o Joseph R. Larson  
Ogden, Gibson, Brooks & Longoria, LLP  
711 Louisiana  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)