



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 29, 2016

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2016-17059

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 620573.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor and a specified position, including the hiring packet for the position.¹ The city indicates it has released some e-mails. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.

Initially, we note the city has only submitted e-mails. Further, the city does not inform us it has released any information other than e-mails. Although the city states it has submitted a representative sample of the remaining requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the remaining types of information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the types of information the city submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the types of information the

¹We note the requestor clarified the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used).

city submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of Gov't Code § 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Accordingly, to the extent any remaining information responsive to the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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 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 information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the city, city employees, and a city consultant. The city states the communications were made

for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city further states these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on the city's representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. As the city raises no other exceptions to disclosure, it must 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, 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, appearing to read "Paige Thompson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Paige" being more prominent than the last name "Thompson".

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/bw

Ref: ID# 620573

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)