



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 25, 2019

Ms. Kelley K. Messer  
First Assistant City Attorney  
City of Abilene  
P.O. Box 60  
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2019-08120

Dear Ms. Messer:

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# 756048 (ORR# 2019-05).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for copies of two specified severance agreements and a specified e-mail. The city states it is releasing the requested severance agreements. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, the city informs us the submitted information was previously released to a local news station. We note the Act does not permit selective disclosure of information to the public. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). Information that has been voluntarily released to a member of the public may not subsequently be withheld from another member of the public, unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988); *but see* Open Records Decision Nos. 579 (1990) (exchange of information among litigants in "informal" discovery is not "voluntary" release of information for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.007), 454 at 2 (1986) (governmental body that disclosed information because it reasonably concluded that it had constitutional obligation to do so could still invoke statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108). However, in this instance,

the city states the information was “leaked” to the news station without the permission of the city and the city is unable to determine who released the information. We note a governmental body is not precluded from invoking an exception to further public disclosure of information that has been released on a limited basis through no official action and against the wishes and policy of the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 376 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 387 at 3 (1983) (information that is not voluntarily released by a governmental body, but nevertheless comes into another party’s possession, is not henceforth automatically available to everyone). Based on the city’s representations, we find there was no voluntary release of information in this instance. Accordingly, we will consider the city’s arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

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).

The city states the submitted information consists of a communication involving an attorney for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. The city states the communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states the communication was intended to be confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/jxd

Ref: ID# 756048

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.