



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 10, 2009

Mr. Joel K.B. Winful  
Assistant District Attorney  
Dallas County  
411 Elm Street, 5th Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2009-07957

Dear Mr. Winful:

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# 345585.

The Dallas County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney") received a request for the following information: 1) any document showing all databases maintained by Dallas County (the "county") IT department; 2) the latest annual report issued by the county IT department; 3) any year 2000 report issued by the county IT department; 4) the county's record retention schedule; and 5) any e-mails, notes, faxes, or memos concerning a previous request made by the requestor on a specified date. You state you do not have information responsive to categories one, two, three, and four.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>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).

<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 our office that the district attorney does not maintain information responsive to categories 1-4 of the request. Instead, you state that a portion of the requested information is maintained by the Dallas County Commissioners Court. Section 552.201(b) of the Government Code provides that “[e]ach elected county officer is the officer for public information and the custodian, as defined by Section 201.003, Local Government Code, of the information created or received by that county officer’s office.” Gov’t Code § 552.201(b). You represent that the proper custodian of a portion of the requested information is the Dallas County Commissioners Court Administrator. Based on your representations, we conclude that because the district attorney does not maintain portions of the requested information and is not the proper custodian of such information, the Act does not require the district attorney to respond to those portions of the request. This ruling only reaches the information that the district attorney maintains.

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 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 explain that the submitted information constitutes confidential communications between the Civil Division of the district attorney and its clients that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree the submitted information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that the district attorney may withhold under section 552.107.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Adam Leiber  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACL/eeg

Ref: ID# 345585

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)