



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 13, 2013

Mr. Daniel L. Rentfro, Jr.  
Counsel for Town of Rancho Viejo  
The Rentfro Law Firm, P.L.L.C.  
P.O. Box 6355  
Brownsville, Texas 78523-6355

OR2013-14085

Dear Mr. Rentfro:

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# 496199.

The Town of Rancho Viejo (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for a specified memorandum and the audio recording of a meeting that occurred on a specified date. You state the town has released the audio recording of the specified meeting. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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. 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct 1.05 and Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Thus, we will not address your claims under section 552.101 in conjunction with rules 1.05 and 503. We note section 552.107 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to required disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2, 677 (2002).

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 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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, orig. proceeding). 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 submitted letter was prepared by the town’s attorney for the town mayor in order to facilitate the rendition of legal services to the town. You represent this communication was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the town may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

[orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](#), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Fabian". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/dls

Ref: ID# 496199

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)