



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 9, 2013

Mr. Mark G. Daniel  
Counsel for the City of Watauga  
Evans, Daniel, Moore, Evans & Lazarus  
115 West Second Street, Suite 202  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2013-05677

Dear Mr. Daniel:

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# 483398 (City ORR Nos. 13-22, 13-23, and 13-24).

The City of Watauga (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for all e-mail correspondence from three named city council members during a specified time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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). 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 to only 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 to only 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, orig. proceeding). 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 state the information you have marked constitutes communications between the city’s outside legal counsel, the city attorney’s office, and city officials and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential, the city council has not taken any action to have this information voluntarily disclosed, and no officer or employee of the city has voluntarily disclosed the information at issue or consented to such a disclosure. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See*

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 of the Government Code not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the information we have marked under section 552.117 must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1), including the cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117 if the individual did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential or if the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must release the remaining information.

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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cynthia G. Tynan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

Ref: ID# 483398

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)