



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 16, 2019

Mr. Joseph J. Gorfida, Jr.
Counsel for the City of Richardson
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager, & Smith L.L.P.
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2019-19332

Dear Mr. Gorfida:

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# 775757 (Ref. No. 107751).

The City of Richardson (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named individual. The city states it has released some information to the requestor. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, the requestor contends the city has publicly disclosed most of the information responsive to the instant request. The Act does not permit the selective disclosure of information. *See id.* §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). If information has been voluntarily released to any member of the public, then that exact same information 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; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose

information made confidential by law). However, section 552.007 does not prohibit an agency from withholding similar types of information that are not the exact information that has been previously released. The requestor does not argue the city has previously released the exact same information the city now seeks to withhold. Accordingly, we will consider the submitted arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

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. 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). 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 claims the submitted information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city states the information at issue consists of communications between privileged parties. The city further states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these

representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) 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, 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,



Lecelle Clarke
Attorney
Open Records Division

LC/gw

Ref: ID# 775757

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)