KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2017

Mr. Craig M. Price
Assistant District Attorney
County of Grayson
200 South Crockett, Suite 116A
Sherman, Texas 75090

OR2017-04345

Dear Mr. Price:

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# 647252.

Grayson County (the "county") received a request for multiple categories of information pertaining to a named individual's employment, post-termination appeal, and use of the grievance procedure, as well as all documents that reflect or reference a specified e-mail, for specified date ranges. The county claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.[1] We have received comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the county has only submitted eight e-mail strings. Thus, to the extent any additional responsive information existed when the present request was received, we assume it has been released. If such information has not been released, then it must be released at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if

[1]Although the county raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503, 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 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

governmental body concludes that 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 county states the information it has marked consists of confidential communications involving a county attorney and a county official in his capacity as a client. The county indicates these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. The county indicates the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the county has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the county may withhold the information it has marked under

section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county 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,

Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 647252

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)