



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 29, 2015

Ms. Ana Vieira Ayala
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2015-20357

Dear Ms. Ayala:

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# 581835 (OGC# 163219).

The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center (the "university") received a request for all correspondence involving eight named university employees and any employee of four named companies. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the interests of Computer Financial Consultants, Inc. and EPIC System's Corporation ("EPIC"). Accordingly, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments stating why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments

from EPIC. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, No. 12-1007, 2015 WL 3854264, at *9 (Tex. June 19, 2015). You state the university has specific marketplace interests in the information you have marked because the university competes “for research and development of medical breakthroughs and technology, medical/academic training programs, and the provision of hospital and clinical health care services.” In addition, you state the information at issue reveals the university’s plans and strategies with regard to the implementation of an electronic health records system. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the submitted arguments, we find you have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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. 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. 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.

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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).

You claim the remaining information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the remaining information consists of communications between university attorneys and employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the university. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information. Thus, the university may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

In summary, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code and the remaining 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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', with a stylized, cursive script.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 581835

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Parrish
President
Computer Financial Consultants
56 Top Gallant Road
Stamford, Connecticut 06902
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael B. Gerdes
Epic
1979 Milky Way
Verono, Wisconsin 53593
(w/o enclosures)