



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 21, 2020

Mr. Joe Rivera
Counsel for Bell County
Naman, Howell, Smith & Lee, PLLC
P.O. Box 1470
Waco, Texas 76703-1470

OR2020-26501

Dear Mr. Rivera:

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# 850089.

Bell County (the "county"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding a specified written authorization. You state some of the requested information does not exist.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.² We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body to create or release information that did not exist when a request for information was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

² Although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client and work product privileges for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, as in this case, are sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

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.

Initially, you state the requestor asks a question in the instant request. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or create new information in responding to a request. *See Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266; ORDs 605 at 2, 563 at 8, 555 at 1-2. However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 1-2. Therefore, while the county is not required to create information in response to the question at issue, documents from which this information may be derived would be responsive to this request. In this instance, the county has submitted information for our review. Therefore, we assume the county has made a good-faith effort to locate any information responsive to the question at issue, and we will address your claimed exceptions for the information at issue.

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 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 county, county employees, and a county official that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the county. You further state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, the county may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

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/jxd

Ref: ID# 850089

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.