



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 21, 2020

Ms. Courtney M. White  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Amarillo  
P.O. Box 1971  
Amarillo, Texas 79105-1971

OR2020-26544

Dear Ms. White:

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# 849912 (GovQA 3256).

The City of Amarillo (the "city") received a request for communications between specified city employees and officials pertaining to two specified subjects during a specified time period. You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to 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. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, because sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. See *id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

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.*, 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).

You state the information you indicated constitutes communications between city attorneys, city officials, and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part:

(a) Reports, records, and information received from any source, including from a federal agency or from another state, furnished to a public health district, a health authority, a local health department, or the [Texas Department of State Health Services] that relate to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are confidential and may be used only for the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Reports, records, and information relating to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are not public information under [the Act], and

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

may not be released or made public on subpoena or otherwise except as provided by Subsections (c), (c-1), (d), and (f).

Health & Safety Code § 81.046(a), (b). In Open Records Decision No. 577 (1990), this office concluded any information acquired or created during an investigation under chapter 81 of the Health and Safety Code is confidential and may not be released unless an exception in the statute applies. *See id.* § 81.046(b)-(d), (f); ORD 577. You state the remaining information relates to the investigation of cases or suspected cases of a contagious disease; thus, section 81.046 governs the release of the information at issue. You state the release provisions of section 81.046 are not applicable. Accordingly, the city must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046(b) of the Health and Safety Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046(b) of the Health and Safety Code.

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,

Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/gw

Ref: ID# 849912

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)