



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 15, 2019

Mr. Rahat Huq
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2019-32319

Dear Mr. Huq:

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# 797111 (GC No. 26123).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to specified laws, including permit applications and decisions. 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 representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the portions of the request related to permit applications and decisions. Although you state you have submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised this open records letter applies to only the types of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302. Therefore, to the extent information responsive to these portions of the request exists and was maintained by the city on the date it received the request, we assume the city has released it to the requestor. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *Id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000)

¹ 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.

(noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances).

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(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 and city employees 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 the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note this otherwise privileged e-mail string includes an e-mail received from a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mail received from the non-privileged party is removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears and stands alone, it is responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if this non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, is maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail

string in which it appears, then the city may not withhold this non-privileged e-mail under section 552.107(1).

To the extent the non-privileged e-mail exists separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, we note a portion of this information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.² Section 552.137 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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a) (c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mail if it is maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears. In this instance, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure, and release the remaining portion of the non privileged e-mail we have marked.

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,



Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/rm

² 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).

Mr. Rahat Huq - Page 4

Ref: ID# 797111

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)