



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 2, 2016

Mr. Brian J. Knowles
Counsel for the City of Hutto
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.
309 East Main Street
Round Rock, Texas 78664-5246

OR2016-09884

Dear Mr. Knowles:

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# 608091.

The City of Hutto (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails between three named city officials regarding a named individual during a specified time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor, with redactions made pursuant to sections 552.024(c) and 552.1175(f) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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). Section 552.1175(f) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact under section 552.1175(b), without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, dates of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals who properly elect to keep this information confidential. *See id.* § 552.1175(b), (f). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.1175(h). *See id.* § 552.1175(g), (h). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

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. 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 state the information you have marked consists of e-mail communications between attorneys for the city and employees and officials of the city that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert these communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. We note some of the information at issue consists of a communication with an individual whom you have not identified or otherwise established is a privileged party. Thus, we conclude you have failed to establish this information, which we have marked for release, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1). Nevertheless, we find you have established the remaining information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Thus, the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the remaining 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, 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, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', with a stylized, cursive script.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 608091

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)