



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2016

Ms. Sonya Palmer
Staff Attorney
Texas Windstorm Insurance Association
P.O. Box 99090
Austin, Texas 78709-9090

OR2016-27704

Dear Ms. Palmer:

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# 637611.

The Texas Windstorm Insurance Association (the "association") received a request for (1) information pertaining to the requestor, and (2) correspondence between a named individual and all human resources employees and staffing vendors. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See*

¹Although the association raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege and work product privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code are sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively. *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002).

²We assume that 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.

Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we must address the association's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days after receiving a written request, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. *Id.* § 552.301(b). The association received the clarified request for information on September 22, 2016. *See id.* § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the 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 overbroad 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). This office does not count the date the request was received for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the association's ten-business-day deadline was October 6, 2016. While the association timely raised section 552.107 of the Government Code within the ten-business-day time period as required by section 552.301(b), the association did not raise section 552.111 of the Government Code until after the ten-business-day deadline had passed. Thus, the association failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code with respect to its claims under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630. Although, the association claims section 552.111 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this exception is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we will consider the association's timely-raised claim under section 552.107 of the Government Code for 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. 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).

You claim the submitted information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the submitted information consists of communications between association attorneys and association employees in their capacities as clients. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the association. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Thus, the association 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 637611

c: Requestor