



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 14, 2020

Ms. Taylor Floyd
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-10896

Dear Ms. Floyd:

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# 822023 (ORR# C000636-012220).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for any notes, sign-in sheets, or documents related to certain meetings during a stated time period and e-mails of any member of the city's Parks and Recreation Department or a named individual sent or received from a named individual referencing a specified topic during a stated time period. The city states it will release some information to the requestor. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ Additionally, the city states release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of the following third parties: Evergreen Design Group; Friends of Reverchon Park; Reverchon Park Sports and Entertainment; and Reverchon Sports and Entertainment, LLC. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these interested third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the

¹ Although the city also raises 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, as in this case, is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1 (2002).

² Although the city informs us it failed to comply with section 552.305 of the Government Code in notifying one of the third parties, we note a violation of section 552.305 does not result in the legal presumption that the requested information is public under section 552.302 of the Government Code.

Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of a representative sample.³

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any interested third party explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the interested third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any interested third party may have in the information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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.*, 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

³ 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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).

The city states Exhibit B consists of communications between a city employee, a city official, and a city attorney that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. The city also states these communications have remained confidential. Based upon these representations and our review, we find Exhibit B consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. As no other exceptions to disclosure for the remaining information have been raised, the city must release the remaining 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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/gw

Ref: ID# 822023

c: Requestor

c: Third Parties