



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 10, 2015

Mr. Scott M. Felton
County Judge
McLennan County Judge's Office
P.O. Box 1728
Waco, Texas 76703-1728

OR2015-06893

Dear Mr. Felton:

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# 559559.

The McLennan County Judge's Office (the "county judge's office") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to the creation of the position of criminal justice program analyst. The county judge's office states it has released some of the requested information. The county judge's office claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception the county judge's office claims and reviewed the submitted information.

The county judge's office states it sought clarification of the requests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). The county judge's office states it has not received a response to the request for clarification. Thus, for the portion of the requested information for which the county judge's office has

¹Although the county judge's office raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

sought but has not received clarification, we find the county judge's office is not required to release information in response to this portion of the request. However, if the requestor clarifies this portion of the requests for information, the county judge's office must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this case, as county judge's office has submitted information responsive to the request and has made arguments against disclosure of this information, we will address the applicability of its arguments to the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *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 "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *See* 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. *See 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The county judge's office states the submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for McLennan County (the "county") and county employees and officials. The county judge's office states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the county judge's office has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Thus, the county judge's office may withhold the submitted 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 providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 559559

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)