



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 12, 2019

Ms. Paige Saenz  
Counsel for the City of Leander  
The Knight Law Firm, LLP  
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105  
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2019-31776

Dear Ms. Saenz:

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# 796479.

The City of Leander (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified entity during a defined period of time. You state the city released some of the requested information. 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 information.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the city received the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, the city has not complied with the procedural requirements prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking an open records decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because section 552.107

can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your argument under this section for the submitted information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

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)(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).

You state the submitted responsive information consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city officials. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Thus, the city may generally withhold the submitted responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of the otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails and an attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails and attachment 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 the city maintains these non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then these non-privileged e-mails and attachments are not excepted under section 552.107(1), and the city must release them.


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).<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue does not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the submitted responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the city maintains these non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then these non-privileged e-mails and attachments are not excepted under section 552.107(1), and the city must release them. In that instance, the city must (1) withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure and (2) release the remaining responsive information.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jahna Ward  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JW/rm

---

<sup>1</sup> The 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).

Ms. Paige Saenz - Page 4

Ref: ID# 796479

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)