



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2016

Ms. Rachel Saucier
Legal Assistant
City of Georgetown
P.O. Box 409
Georgetown, Texas 78627-0409

OR2016-04910

Dear Ms. Saucier:

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# 600360 (ORR# G001925-121715).

The City of Georgetown (the "city") received a request for (1) all internal and external correspondence from city employees, elected officials, or Emergency Services District officials, which references a specified property during a specified time period; (2) any files created by the city's Code Enforcement Department referencing the specified property; and (3) all notes prepared by attendees at a specified meeting. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although the city raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, we note section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Additionally, although the city raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the submitted information, 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(1). *See* ORD 676 at 6.

²We 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.

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

The city states the submitted information consists of communications between city employees and attorneys or attorney representatives for the city. The city states the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted communications. However, we note some of the otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails sent to or received from a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if these e-mails are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the instant request. Therefore, if the city maintains these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, 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.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the city maintains the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, 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) and this information must be released.

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 that reads "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/bhf

Ref: ID# 600360

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)