



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 22, 2005

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2005-10575

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 236862.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for copies of: 1) the city's ethics ordinance, 2) the city's agenda and supporting documents for Entertainment Task Force resolutions, and 3) information pertaining to the Buddy Holly Center. You indicate that some information will be released to the requestor. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107 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

¹Although you raise sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how these exceptions apply to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume you have withdrawn these exceptions. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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 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 indicate that the submitted information consists of confidential communications involving city attorneys. You have identified the city attorneys who were party to the submitted communications; however, you have not identified the other individuals who were party to the submitted communications. We have reviewed the submitted records and marked the information that we are able to discern from the face of the records constitutes privileged communications. The information we have marked may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107. However, the remaining information that you seek to withhold under section 552.107 involves communications to or between individuals whom you have failed to identify, and we are unable to identify, as attorneys or employees of the city. Accordingly, we are unable to conclude that communications involving such unidentified individuals are protected by the attorney-client privilege, and thus, this information may not be withheld on this basis.

Next, you claim that some of the remaining information is confidential under section 552.137 of the Government Code. In relevant part, section 552.137 provides that, “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). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). The city must withhold the e-mail address that we have marked under section 552.137, unless the city receives consent for its release.

In summary, the city may withhold the portions of the submitted information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The e-mail address that we have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its disclosure. The remaining information must be released.

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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/segh

Ref: ID# 236862

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Pamela Brink
2301 Broadway
Lubbock, Texas 79401
(w/o enclosures)