



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 3, 2016

Mr. Oscar G. Gabaldón, Jr.  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
The City of El Paso  
P.O. Box 1890  
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2016-17519

Dear Mr. Gabaldon:

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# 622715 (Ref. No. 16-1026-7523).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for any legal opinion prepared for or by the El Paso City Attorney's Office concerning Uber's operation in the city. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney work product privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.111 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

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 states the submitted information consists of communications involving a city attorney and city employees. The city states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and the communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Thus, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</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/>

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

[ori\\_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,



Britni Ramirez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BR/bhf

Ref: ID# 622715

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)