



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 8, 2022

Mr. Reggie Hollins
Legal Technology Specialist
City of Plano
P.O. Box 860358
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2022-06913

Dear Mr. Hollins:

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# 934476 (Ref. No. FD-R006257).

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for all e-mail communications pertaining to a certain exam during a stated time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception you claim 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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

¹ The city states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² Although the city also raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is sections 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

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 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 city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to most of the information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the information we have marked for release was sent to an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the city shares a privileged relationship. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate this information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information we have marked for release under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(19) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of “a firefighter or volunteer firefighter or emergency medical services personnel as defined by Section 773.003, Health and Safety Code,” regardless of whether the individual complies with section 552.024 or section 552.1175 of the Government

Code.³ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(19). We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, then the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(19) of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(19) of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. 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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACB/ba

Ref: ID# 934476

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ 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).