



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2016

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West 7th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2016-27756

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 638310 (OGC# 172033).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for communications for a specified time period that refer to the requestor. You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the requestor excluded from the request documents authored exclusively by the requestor. Accordingly, this type of information is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information,

¹We 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.

and the system is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-12465 (2015). In that ruling we determined, the system may withhold the submitted information under sections 552.107(1) and 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the system may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-12465 as a previous determination and withhold the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information is not subject to Open Records Letter No. 2015-12465, we will consider your argument against disclosure.

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 system states the submitted information consists of confidential communications involving system attorneys and system employees in their capacities as clients. The system states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the system. The system states the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the system has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the system may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the system may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-12456 as a previous determination and withhold the requested information in accordance with that ruling. The system 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 cursive script that reads "Erin Groff".

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/som

Ref: ID# 638310

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)