



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 25, 2015

Ms. Christine Badillo
Counsel for the Manor Independent School District
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Russo & Kyle, P.C.
P. O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2015-17670

Dear Ms. Badillo:

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# 577318.

The Manor Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a previous request for information made by the requestor. The district claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

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 "to facilitate 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.

¹Although the district also raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990) (predecessor statute).

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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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).

The submitted information consists of an e-mail string. The district explains this information consists of communications between an attorney for and representative of the district that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The district also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note the information at issue includes e-mails received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to the non-privileged party are removed from the e-mail string and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the district may not withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code but, instead, must release it to the requestor.²

²We note the non-privileged information contains an e-mail address to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b). However, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the district receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have a right of access to it, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the district to redact the requestor’s e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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, 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/eb

Ref: ID# 577318

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)