



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 22, 2004

Mr. Cary L. Bovey  
Bovey, Akers & Bojorquez, LLP  
12325 Hymeadow Drive, Suite 3-200  
Austin, Texas 78750

OR2004-6124

Dear Mr. Bovey:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208655.

The City of Bartlett (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the employment records of a named person, certain policies and procedures, and termination records of former city police officers. The city has released most of the information to the requestor. The city asserts the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure information made confidential by law, including information made confidential by other statutes. The submitted F-5 forms, Reports of Separation of License Holder, are subject to section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.452 requires that a law enforcement agency submit a report to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement regarding an officer licensed under chapter 1701 whose appointment with the law enforcement agency is terminated. *See* Occ. Code § 1701.452. Section 1701.454 provides:

- (a) A report or statement submitted to the commission under this subchapter is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552 of the Government Code, unless the person resigned or was terminated due to substantiated incidents of excessive force or violations of the law other than traffic offenses.

(b) Except as provided by this subsection, a commission member or other person may not release the contents of a report or statement submitted under this subchapter. The report or statement may be released only by the commission employee having the responsibility to maintain the report or statement and only if:

(1) the head of a law enforcement agency or the agency head's designee makes a written request on the agency's letterhead for the report or statement accompanied by the agency head's or designee's signature; and

(2) the person who is the subject of the report or statement authorizes the release by providing a sworn statement on a form supplied by the commission that includes the person's waiver of liability regarding an agency head who is responsible for or who takes action based on the report or statement.

Occ. Code § 1701.454. You inform us that the F-5 forms do not meet the criteria for disclosure provided under section 1701.454. Therefore, the city must withhold the F-5 forms pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.454 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within 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 "for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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 to whom disclosure is made in

furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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 that the remaining submitted records are communications between the city attorney and city officials. The city further explains that the communications were intended to be confidential, and it has not waived the privilege. Based on the city’s representations and our review of the information, we agree that the remaining submitted records are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 as privileged communications between a client and an attorney made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general’s Open Government Hotline, toll free,

at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Yen-Ha Le  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 208655

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Tony Conners  
Brim, Arnett, Soifer, Robinett, Hanner & Conners, P.C.  
2525 Wallingwood Drive, Building 14  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)