



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 16, 2015

Mr. John W. Peeler
Counsel for the Harris County Emergency Services District No. 11
Coveler & Katz, P.C.
820 Gessner, Suite 1710
Houston, Texas 77024-8261

OR2015-19282

Dear Mr. Peeler:

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# 579285.

The Harris County Emergency Services District No. 11 (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for communications between Coveler & Katz, PC ("Coveler"), and any member of the district's board of directors pertaining to a specified topic. You claim the submitted information is not subject to the Act. In the alternative, you state you will redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code and personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² You also state you notified a named individual of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why

¹Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.024(c)(2), .117. Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

²We 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 No. 676 at 1 -2 (2002).

the submitted information should not be released.³ *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You contend the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." *See id.* §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as the following:

[1]Information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Section 552.002(a-1) also provides the following:

Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and, thus, is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The

³As of the date of this letter, we have not received any comments from an individual explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released to the requestor.

Act also encompasses information a governmental body does not physically possess. Information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns, has a right of access to, or spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). You inform us the submitted information consists of e-mails that were not sent from a district e-mail address, and Coveler did not charge the district for any time spent on these e-mails. We note, however, the request is for communications pertaining to a specified topic related to the business of the district. Additionally, the submitted information consists of communications between Coveler and a commissioner of the district acting in the commissioner's official capacity pertaining to official business of the district. Accordingly, we find the submitted information consists of information that is maintained by the district for the transaction of official business. Thus, the submitted information is subject to the Act and must be released, unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act.

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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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. 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, 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. *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 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 information consists of communications between district attorneys and a district official that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 579285

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)