



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 22, 2017

Ms. Roxella T. Cavazos
Associate General Counsel
The Alamo Community College District
201 West Sheridan Street, Building C-8
San Antonio, Texas 78204-1429

OR2017-13842

Dear Ms. Cavazos:

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# 662910.

The Alamo Community College District (the "district") received a request for five categories of information related to the requestor's employment with the district and district pay scales and job descriptions. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.116, and 552.135 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). The district received the request for information on March 29, 2017. You do not inform us the district was closed for any business days between March 29, 2017, and April 12, 2017. Therefore, you were required request a decision from

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for the submitted information, you provide no arguments explaining how this exception is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this exception. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301, .302.

this office by April 12, 2017. However, the envelope in which the district requested a ruling from this office was postmarked April 13, 2017. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 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). You claim sections 552.107, 552.116, and 552.135 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.107 and 552.135 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your arguments under these exceptions against release of the submitted information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining claimed exception.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov't Code* § 552.107(1). 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).

You state the submitted information was communicated by a district employee to an attorney for the district. You state this communication was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You further state these communication was intended to be confidential and has 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 district 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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/tdw

Ref: ID# 662910

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)