



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 3, 2016

Ms. Lauren Downey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Information Coordinator  
General Counsel Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2016-02200A

Dear Ms. Downey:

Our office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-02200 (2016) on January 28, 2016. We have examined this ruling and determined that an error was made in its issuance. When this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306 of the Government Code, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on January 28, 2016. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act")). You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Act. Your request was assigned ID# 604909 (OAG PIR Nos. 15-42764 and 15-42765).

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received two requests from the same requestor for all e-mail correspondence related to a specified topic, as well as all e-mail correspondence between the OAG and any of twenty-six named entities. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, as you acknowledge, the requestor seeks information created through the date of the requests, as well as information created after the date of the requests. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present request consists of information the OAG maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the requests.

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

---

<sup>1</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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.


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 submitted information was communicated between the OAG, client agencies of the OAG, outside attorneys who represent client agencies, and other privileged parties. You explain the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the state. Further, you state the communications at issue were not intended to be disclosed and have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the OAG has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the OAG 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/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,



Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

---

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

Ref: ID# 604909

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)