



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2008

Mr. Loren B. Smith
Olson & Olson L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019

OR2008-10664

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 318215.

The City of Friendswood (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for documents pertaining to a specified business's parking lot agreement.¹ You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.³

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body

¹We note that the requestor clarified her original request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b)(governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information). Further, we note that the requestor subsequently excluded from her request e-mail addresses that are confidential under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Accordingly, information subject to this exception is 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 city is not required to release that information.

²Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Further, we note that as the submitted information is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, rule 503 does not apply in this instance. *See* ORD 676 at 4.

³We note that although you raise section 552.111 of the Government Code, you make no argument to support this exception. Therefore, we conclude that you have waived your claim under this section. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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 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 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)-(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 contend that the submitted information consists of privileged communications involving the city’s attorney and the city. You indicate these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to the city. You also indicate that these communications were made in confidence and that their confidentiality has been maintained. Accordingly, we find that the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 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 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 318215

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sara McDonald
Galveston Daily News
c/o Mr. Loren B. Smith
Olson & Olson L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019
(w/o enclosures)