



February 26, 2015

Mr. Guillermo Trevino  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2015-03813

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 555829 (P.I.R. No. W038847).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all e-mails sent or received by five named individuals during a specified time period pertaining to Taser International ("Taser") body cameras and/or evidence.com "cloud" storage.<sup>1</sup> You state the city has released most of the responsive information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us you sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the city received the required deposit on December 12, 2014. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

<sup>2</sup>We note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002).*

have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

Initially, you state portions of Exhibits C-1 and C-4 are not responsive to the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and that information need not be released.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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, 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, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be

---

<sup>3</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.

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 claim the responsive information you have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between city employees and city attorneys. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> However, we note some of the e-mail strings at issue consists of e-mails received from Taser. During the time the communications were made, the city and Taser were engaged in contract negotiations; thus, their interests were adverse. Accordingly, at the time the communications at issue were made, the parties did not share a common interest that would allow the attorney-client privilege to apply. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(c); *In re Monsanto*, 998 S.W.2d 917, 922 (Tex. App.—Waco 1999, orig. proceeding) (discussing the “joint-defense” privilege incorporated by rule 503(b)(1)(C); *In re XL Speciality Ins. Co.*, 373 S.W.3d 46, 51 (Tex. 2012) (discussing common interest rule under attorney-client privilege). Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to Taser are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, we address your claims under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this privilege is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

We note section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (Gov't Code § 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). In order for section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

You claim the non-privileged e-mails contain advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding the city's policy mission. However, as noted above, the e-mails at issue consist of communications related to contract negotiations between the city and Taser. Because the city and Taser were negotiating a contract, their interests were adverse at the time the communications were made. Thus, we find you have failed to establish the city shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with Taser with respect to these communications. However, you have established that a portion of the remaining information at issue constitutes advice, opinions, or recommendations regarding policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the non-privileged e-mails we have marked exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the city must release those non-privileged e-mails. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/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 "Tamara H. Holland". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tamara H. Holland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

THH/bhf

Ref: ID# 555829

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)