



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 19, 2022

Ms. Aliceson Cotton
Counsel for the City of Frisco
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75069

OR2022-11331

Dear Ms. Cotton:

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# 942870 (Ref. Nos. G054722 and G054998).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all communications regarding inspections and permitting for a specified address. The city received a second request from a different requestor for information pertaining to a specified project, including inspection reports, communications, and plans.¹ The city released some information to the requestors. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² 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. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental

¹ The city states it sent the requestors cost estimates of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimates of charges required the requestors to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). The city informs us it received the required deposits on January 24, 2022, and January 25, 2022. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

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 section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

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 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), 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).

The city claims the submitted information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city states the information at issue consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may generally withhold the submitted e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to the 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 and attachments, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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).³ See Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note the second requestor has a right to his own and his client’s e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *Id.* § 552.137(b). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, except for the e-mail address belonging to the second requestor and his client, which must be released to the second requestor, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the submitted e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails and attachments we have marked are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Except for the e-mail address belonging to the second requestor and his client, which must be released to the second requestor, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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,

Katie Stallcup
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AKS/be

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).

Ms. Aliceson Cotton - Page 4

Ref: ID# 942870

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)