



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 27, 2019

Mr. Ken Campbell
Counsel for Hays County Emergency Services District No. 8
Burns, Anderson, Jury & Brenner, L. L. P.
P. O. Box 26300
Austin, Texas 78755

OR2019-17656

Dear Mr. Campbell:

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# 772509 (Your File No. 019.15951).

Hays County Emergency Services District No. 8 (the "district"), which you represent, received seven requests from the same requestor for information and communications pertaining to named individuals, as well as information pertaining to specified complaints and investigations. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

¹Although you also 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 Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002).

²We 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present requests because it does not pertain to the time periods requested by the requestor or was created after the date of the present requests. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the district need not release it in response to these requests.

Next, we must address the requestor's contention the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements of the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(d) of the Government Code, a governmental body must, within ten business days of receiving the request for information, provide the requestor with (1) a written statement the governmental body wishes to withhold the requested information and has asked for a decision from the attorney general, and (2) a copy of the governmental body's written communication to the attorney general. *Id.* § 552.301(d). We note the district received the first four requests for information after business hours on April 4, 2019. Therefore, for the purposes of section 552.301, the district received the requests at issue on April 5, 2019. This office does not count the date the requests were received for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Therefore, the district's ten-business-day deadline to provide information to the requestor pursuant to section 552.301(d) was April 19, 2019. The district's correspondence to the requestor including the information required by section 552.301(d) was sent on April 19, 2019. Therefore, we find the district complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision.

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). 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, 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 an attorney for the district and district employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the responsive information consists of privileged attorney-client communications the district may generally withhold 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 have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1), but instead must release them.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/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

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 district 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 district to redact the requestor’s e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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 "Erin Groff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Erin" and last name "Groff" clearly distinguishable.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 772509

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)