



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 25, 2019

Ms. Patricia L. Akers
Counsel for the City of Bee Cave
Akers & Akers, LLP
13625 Pond Springs Road, Suite 204
Austin, Texas 78729

OR2019-08215

Dear Ms. Akers:

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# 756497.

The City of Bee Cave (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for communications concerning a named officer and the requestor.¹ You claim 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 submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[,]" unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold the court-filed documents under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387. (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider the city's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also consider the city's argument against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See*

ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) consists of attachments to e-mails between attorneys for the city and city employees and officials. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city, and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the attachments are part of privileged e-mail communications for purposes of rule 503. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, a representative sample of which we marked, under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.107 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. 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. 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state the remaining information consists of communications between attorneys for the city and city employees and officials that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find some of the remaining information, a representative sample of which we marked, consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to individuals you have not demonstrated are 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, a representative sample of 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). Moreover, the remaining information contains a communication that was not made for the purposes of providing legal services. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information

constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107 of the Government Code. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).² Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not within the scope of section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, a representative sample of which we marked, under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. With the exception of the e-mail we marked for release, the city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the city maintains the non-privileged e-mails, a representative sample of which we marked, 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) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information.³

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/>

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³We note the information being released contains an e-mail address to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b). However, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the city receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have a right of access to it, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the city to redact the requestor’s e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

[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 that reads "D. Michelle Case". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish at the end.

D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMC/gw

Ref: ID# 756497

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)