



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 11, 2022

Mr. Rick L. Lambert
Counsel for the Coolidge Independent School District
Powell Law Group, LLP
108 Wild Basin Road, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2022-04171

Dear Mr. Lambert:

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# 930900.

The Coolidge Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for seven categories of information related to the district and specified third parties. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See id.* § 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. 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

¹ Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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 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 submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were confidential and have been kept confidential. Based on your representations and our review we find, except for the information we have marked for release, the district may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of the e-mail strings at issue include e-mails received from or sent to parties you have not demonstrated to be privileged. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. In addition, we find you have failed to establish the information we have marked for release constitutes privileged communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1), and the district may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether the e-mail addresses at issue belong to district employees or officials or fall within the scope of section 552.137(c). Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, except for the information we have marked for release, the district may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The district 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

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).

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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/be

Ref: ID# 930900

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)