



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 18, 2017

Mr. Brad Bowman
General Counsel
Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation
P.O. Box 12157
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2017-21316

Dear Mr. Bowman:

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# 675622.

The Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to six specified terms during a designated time period, including e-mails sent to or from four named department employees.¹ You state the department released some information. You indicate the department will redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.² Further, you indicate the department will withhold certain information under

¹We note the requestor clarified his 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).

²Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2).

sections 552.130(c), 552.136(c), and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.³ Additionally, you indicate, pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), you will redact personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ We understand the department will redact dates of birth of living persons pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2016-02039 (2016).⁵ You claim some of 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 information.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks information between “May 10th and the date the request is fulfilled, or June 25th, whichever is later.” It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See Gov’t Code* §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975).* Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987).* Thus, the only information encompassed by the request consists of information the department maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the request.

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).

³Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

⁵Open Records Letter No. 2016-02039 is a previous determination authorizing the department to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

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 information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the department, department representatives, and department employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. 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 information at issue. Thus, the department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. As the department 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 a large initial "P" and "T".

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 675622

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)