ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 24, 2005

Ms. Julie Joe
Assistant County Attorney
Travis County
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2005-05624

Dear Ms. Joe:

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# 226778.

The Travis County Judge's Office, two Travis County commissioners, and the Travis County Attorney's Office (collectively, the "county") each received the same request for information pertaining to the hiring of private law firms to collect delinquent taxes for the county. You state that some of the submitted information is not responsive to the request for information; accordingly, this ruling does not address the public availability of this particular information and the county is not required to release it in response to this ruling. You also state that most of the requested information will be released, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.117 of the Government Code and protected under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[1]

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

[1]We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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).

The county asserts that the submitted information you have identified as attorney-client communications consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the county made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. Based on this representation and our review of the information at issue, we agree that this information consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the county may withhold under section 552.107.[2]

You contend that a phone number in the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential

---

[2]Because we are able to resolve this under section 552.107, we do not address your other argument for exception of the attorney-client communications.

under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the county must withhold the phone number you have marked if it is the home telephone number of a current or former employee of the county who elected, prior to the county's receipt of the request for information, to keep the number confidential. The number may not be withheld if the individual did not make a timely election.

To conclude, the county may withhold the attorney-client communications marked under section 552.107, and the county must withhold under section 552.117 the marked phone number if it is the home telephone number of a current or former employee of the county who elected, prior to the county's receipt of the request for information, to keep such information confidential. The county must release the remaining information at issue.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Pub. 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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/seg

Ref: ID# 226778

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Marty Toohey
Travis County reporter
The Austin American-Statesman
P.O. Box 670
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David A. Escamilla
Travis County Attorney
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)

Hon. Ron Davis
Travis County Commissioner
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)

Hon. Sam Biscoe
Travis County Judge
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)

Hon. Margaret Gómez
Travis County Commissioner
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)