



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 23, 2020

Mr. Tyrone Lin
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2020-24011

Dear Mr. Lin:

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# 845686 (GC No. 26792).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for specified information pertaining to a specified address. We understand you will redact e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Brickmoon Design ("Brickmoon") and Total Surveyors, Inc. ("Total"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Brickmoon and Total of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *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 Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

We note 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 Brickmoon or Total explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude those third parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to those third parties on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in the 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. *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.* 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 some of the submitted information consists of privileged communications involving a city attorney and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. Based on your representations and our review, we find the

information we marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of the information at issue was shared with an individual whom you have not demonstrated to be a privileged party. Therefore, you have failed to establish how the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. 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,

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/gw

Ref: ID# 845686

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)