



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 5, 2020

Mr. Hal C. Hawes
General Counsel
Williamson County Commissioners Court
710 Main Street, Suite 200
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2020-27792

Dear Mr. Hawes:

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# 852868.

Williamson County (the "county") received a request for all electronic communications between two named individuals during a stated time period. You indicate the county released some information to the requestor. We understand the county has redacted personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted 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* 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

¹ Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

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 information you marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the county and county employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You also state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. You further state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the county may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

As noted above, we understand the county will redact personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684. We note the remaining information contains additional personal e-mail addresses. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body[.]” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).² Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the county must withhold the additional personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the county may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the additional personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The county 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/jm

Ref: ID# 852868

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)