



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 22, 2008

Mr. Marc J. Schnall
City Attorney
City of Selma
Trinity Plaza II
745 East Mulberry, Suite 900
San Antonio, Texas 78212-3166

OR2008-09938

Dear Mr. Schnall:

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# 316610.

The City of Selma (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) all written or audio recorded correspondence and city council or zoning board meeting minutes pertaining to a specified address, subdivision, and tract of land, and (2) all invoices and accounting documents related to a specified subdivision and tract of land. You state you have provided most of the requested information to the requestor. You also state you have no information responsive to the request for audio recordings.¹ You claim that the submitted correspondence, insurance certificates, work bonds, and checks are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed 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

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

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 memoranda, e-mails with attachments, and letter with attachments, which you have marked, 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 city, and that the communications were to be kept confidential among the intended parties. Finally, you state that the city has not waived its privilege with respect to any of the communications at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the memoranda, e-mails with attachments, and letter with attachments you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You contend that portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. This section 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. We agree that the insurance policy numbers and bank account numbers you have marked, as well as the bank routing numbers we have marked, must be

withheld under section 552.136. However, you have failed to explain how the bond identification numbers you have marked constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Consequently, these numbers may not be withheld on this basis. As you have claimed no other exceptions for the bond identification numbers, they must be released.

In summary, the city may withhold the memoranda, e-mails with attachments, and letter with attachments you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers and bank account numbers you have marked, as well as the bank routing numbers we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 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
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/ma

Ref: ID# 316610

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Wayne Haese
15416 Capri Lane
Selma, Texas 78154
(w/o enclosures)