



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 21, 2020

Ms. Rebekah A. Wendt  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 368  
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2020-01889

Dear Ms. Wendt:

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# 807294 (GC No. 26257).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for e-mails and text messages sent to and from a named individual including certain keywords during specified date ranges. You state the city will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We 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). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we must address the requestor's assertion the city failed to comply with section 552.301(b) of the Government Code in requesting this decision. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See id.* § 552.301(a), (b). You state, and provide documentation showing, the city received the

---

<sup>1</sup> We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

request for information on October 9, 2019. You state, and provide documentation showing, the city sought and received clarification of the information requested on October 9, 2019. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request). You further state, and provide documentation showing, the city provided the requestor with a written statement itemizing the estimate of the charges for responding to the request and requiring a deposit on payment of these charges pursuant to sections 552.2615 and 552.263 of the Government Code on October 21, 2019. *See id.* § 552.2615 (providing governmental body shall provide requestor with estimate of charges if charges exceed \$40), .263(a) (governmental body may require deposit or bond for payment of anticipated costs in certain instances if governmental body provides requestor with written itemized statement). In response to the itemized statement, the requestor paid the deposit on October 23, 2019. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit). Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline for requesting a ruling from this office was November 6, 2019. The envelope in which the city provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked November 5, 2019. *See id.* § 552.301(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Therefore, we find the city 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. *See id.* § 552.107(1). 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 states the submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for the city, city employees, and other privileged parties. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states these communications were confidential, and does not indicate the city has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. 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. Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Katie Stallcup  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

AKS/eb

Ref: ID# 807294

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.