



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2019

Ms. Megan Santee  
Counsel for the City of Wimberly  
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal, & Zech, PC  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2019-08787

Dear Ms. Santee:

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# 757239 (ID Number PIA 19-010).

The City of Wimberly (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails with specified keywords during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, you state some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for a ruling, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2018-29732 (2018). We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Thus, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2018-29732 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law,

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that 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.

facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, we will address your arguments for the submitted information, which was not the subject of the previous ruling.

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* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). 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)(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. *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 submitted information consists of communications between attorneys for the city, city officials, city employees, and a privileged party that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the

submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2018-29732 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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,



Patrick P. Mehaffy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PPM/gw

Ref: ID# 757239

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.