



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 5, 2006

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

OR2006-03379

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# 245552.

The Travis County Transportation and Natural Resources Department (the "department") received a request for the requestor's personnel file. You inform us that you have released some of the responsive information to the requestor. You claim that 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. Prior decisions of this office have held that section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms), 226 (1979) (W-2 forms). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue

---

<sup>1</sup>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.

Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *dismissed in part aff'd in part, vacated in part, and remanded*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as "a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of income, payments, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Internal Revenue Service] with respect to a return . . . or the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, . . . penalty, . . . , or offense[.]" *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A).

Section 6103(e) is an exception to the confidentiality provisions of section 6103(a) that provides for disclosure of tax information to the taxpayer and certain other persons having a material interest in the return. *See id.* § 6103(e)(7) (information may be disclosed to any person authorized by subsection(e) to obtain such information if Secretary of Treasury determines such disclosure would not seriously impair tax administration); *see also, Lake v. Rubin*, 162 F.3d 113 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (26 U.S.C. § 6103 represents exclusive statutory route for taxpayer to gain access to own return information and overrides individual's right of access under 5 U.S.C. § 552a(d)(1) to federal agency records concerning self). In this instance, the requestor is the employee whose W-4 form is at issue. Therefore, under section 6103(e)(7), the department must disclose the submitted W-4 form to the requestor, provided that such disclosure would not seriously impair federal tax administration. Otherwise, the information at issue is confidential under section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, you claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. This section protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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. 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 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 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).

In this instance, you inform us that the documents at issue are communications between employees of the department and attorneys representing the department. You explain that confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information for which you claim section 552.107 consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the department may withhold.

In summary, the department must disclose the submitted W-4 form to the requestor, provided that such disclosure would not seriously impair federal tax administration. Otherwise, the information at issue is confidential under section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The information for which you claim section 552.107 consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the department may withhold.

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,



James Forrest  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JF/er

Ref: ID# 245552

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jo Carol Bradshaw  
4806 Pewter Lane  
Austin, Texas 78744  
(w/o enclosures)