



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 20, 2016

Mr. David V. Overcash  
Counsel for the City of Princeton  
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.  
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2016-08906

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 610605 (ORR# W000560-022316).

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a previous request for information made to the city. The city states it has released some of the requested information, but claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the request for information because it was created after the city received the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release this information in response to this request.

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. 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 city asserts the responsive information it has marked under section 552.107(1) consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. It also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to this information. Thus, the city may generally withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of the responsive e-mail strings at issue include e-mails received from or sent to the requestor, who is a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to the requestor are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the city maintains these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then it may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1)

of the Government Code but, instead, must release them to the requestor. The city must release the remaining responsive information.<sup>1</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/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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/eb

Ref: ID# 610605

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the responsive information being released 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 city 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 city to redact the requestor's e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.