



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 27, 2016

Ms. Victoria D. Honey  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-12171

Dear Ms. Honey:

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# 611917 (PIR No. W049633-021916).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified property during a specified time period.<sup>1</sup> You state the city has released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for the request under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the city received on March 7, 2016. *See Gov't Code* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

<sup>2</sup>Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we 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 Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002).*

<sup>3</sup>We 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.

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* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). 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 attorneys for the city and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. 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 the city may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if those e-mails are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in

which they appear, then the city may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note the marked non-privileged e-mails contain personal e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. In that instance, the city must (1) withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release; and (2) 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](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,



Lee Seidlits  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CLS/bw

---

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 611917

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)