



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 7, 2019

Ms. Juanita Fonseca  
City Secretary  
City of Dilley  
P.O. Box 230  
Dilley, Texas 78017

OR2019-00331

Dear Ms. Fonseca:

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# 742103.

The City of Dilley (the "city") received a request for communications between specified parties pertaining to CoreCivic and United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE"). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.131 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request because it was created after the date the instant request was received. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we marked, and the city need not release it in response to this request.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note 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 6 (2002).

Next, we must address the city'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). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, the city received the request for information on September 13, 2018. You do not inform us the city was closed for any business days between September 13, 2018, and October 4, 2018. Thus, the city was required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by September 27, 2018 and by section 552.301(e) by October 4, 2018. However, the envelope in which the city provided the information required by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) was postmarked October 5, 2018. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) 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, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). You claim sections 552.107 and 552.131 of the Government Code for the information at issue. Because sections 552.107 and 552.131(a) can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of sections 552.107 and 552.131(a) to the responsive information at issue. However, we find you failed to establish a compelling reason to address your claim under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides, in part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

Gov't Code § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) only protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. In this instance, no third party has made a demonstration that any of the information at issue constitutes a trade secret or that release of any of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See generally* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5–6 (1999), 552 at 5 (1990). Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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). 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. *See 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 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 responsive information consists of communications between attorneys for the city, a representative of the city's attorneys, and a city employee that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. However, you have failed to identify the parties to the communications in the responsive information. *See* ORD 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made; this office cannot necessarily assume that communication was made among only categories of individuals identified in rule 503). *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Nevertheless, upon review, we are able to discern from the face of the documents that certain individuals are privileged parties. Accordingly, we conclude the responsive information we marked may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). However, the remaining information either does not reveal a communication or reveals a communication with a party we are not able to discern is privileged. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the responsive information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The city must release the remaining responsive 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 cursive script that reads "Ashley Crutchfield".

Ashley Crutchfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AC/mo

Ref: ID# 72103

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)