ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 10, 2008

Mr. Tony Resendez
Attorney at Law
Walsh Anderson Brown Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2008-09425

Dear Mr. Resendez:

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# 315298.

The Santa Gertrudis Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) all documentation that supports the reasons for non-renewal of the requestor's employment contract, (2) all evaluations, growth plans, and disciplinary actions since January 1, 2004 regarding the requestor, and (3) all correspondence between several specified individuals since January 1, 2004 regarding the requestor. You claim that the submitted e-mails and attachments are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.137 of the Government Code.[1] We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information).

Initially, we note that, in comments submitted to this office, the requestor has agreed to allow the district to withhold private e-mail addresses from the responsive information. Therefore,

[1] Although you also raise the attorney-client privilege under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note that section 552.107 is the proper exception to raise for your attorney-client privilege claim in this instance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (1988).

any private e-mail addresses within the submitted documents are not responsive to the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district is not required to release that information in response to the request. Accordingly, we need not address your arguments against disclosure under section 552.137.

Next, we note that you have submitted only the e-mails and attachments responsive to the request for correspondence between certain people. You have not submitted any information responsive to the other two categories of requested information. To the extent any information responsive to these aspects of the request existed on the date the district received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such records, you must do so at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.107(1) 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).

You assert that the submitted e-mails and attachments numbered AG-0001 through AG-0050 consist of communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You state that the communications were between clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives identified by the district, and that the communications were to be kept confidential among the intended parties. Finally, you state that the district has not waived its privilege with respect to any of the communications at issue. Therefore, the district may withhold the submitted e-mails and attachments numbered AG-0001 through AG-0050 under section 552.107.

We note that one of the remaining e-mails contains information protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."[2] Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex.1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review of the remaining e-mails, we find that some of the information is highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district must withhold the information we have marked in one of the remaining e-mails under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district may withhold the e-mails and attachments labeled as AG-0001 through AG-0050 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining 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

---

[2] The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,

Leah B. Wingerson

Leah B. Wingerson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/ma

Ref: ID# 315298

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Brenda Gonzalez
c/o Mr. Tony Resendez
Attorney at Law
Walsh Anderson Brown Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin Lungwitz
Attorney at Law
Lungwitz & Lungwitz, P.C.
3005 S. Lamar Blvd., Suite D-109-362
Austin, Texas 78704-4785
(w/o enclosures)