



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 20, 2017

Ms. Lauren Downey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Information Coordinator  
Office of the Attorney General  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2017-21554

Dear Ms. Downey:

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# 675996 (PIR Nos. 17-46928 and 17-46933).

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received two requests from the same requestor for sixteen categories of information, including information pertaining to the requestor, specified positions, named and specified OAG employees, and sanctions involving certain individuals. The OAG states it will release most of the requested information. The OAG states it does not have information responsive to some of the specified categories of the second request.<sup>1</sup> The OAG states it will redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code and certain information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Further, the OAG states,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup>Section 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). Section 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 id.* § 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).

pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), it will redact personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> The OAG claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which consists of a representative sample.<sup>5</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup>Open 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.

<sup>4</sup>The OAG states it sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). The OAG also informs us it received the required deposit on June 30, 2017. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

<sup>5</sup>We 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.

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 OAG states the information it marked consists of notes taken by OAG attorneys to document meetings with other OAG attorneys, including attorneys in the OAG's Law Enforcement Defense Division and attorneys in the OAG's Executive Administration. The OAG states the communications at issue were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the State of Texas. Further, the OAG states these communications were not intended to be disclosed and have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties. Upon review, we find the OAG has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the OAG may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Further, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find the information the OAG marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the OAG must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the OAG may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The OAG must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The OAG 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](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", written over a faint, larger version of the same signature.

Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 675996

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)