



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 21, 2007

Mr. Scott A. Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A&M University System  
A&M System Building, Suite 2079  
200 Technology Way  
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2007-03099

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 273968.

The Texas A&M University System (the "system") received a request for twenty-three categories of information related to bequests and gifts to the system, ethical concerns of and complaints made by system attorneys, and performance evaluations and salaries of certain system attorneys. You state that some responsive information has been provided to the requestor. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.1235 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The system claims that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, 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. Finally, 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 the definition of a confidential communication 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 contend that the information you have marked consists of confidential communications made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the system. You have identified the parties to the communications. You state that these communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the system may withhold the information you have highlighted in Exhibit B-1 under section 552.107(1). However, we find that the system has failed to demonstrate that the remaining information at issue consists of confidential communications made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the system. We therefore conclude that the remaining information at issue is not protected by the attorney-client privilege and may not be withheld under section 552.107(1).

Next, we address your claim under section 552.1235 of the Government Code. Section 552.1235 excepts from disclosure “the name or other information that would tend to disclose the identity of a person, other than a governmental body, who makes a gift, grant, or donation of money or property to an institution of higher education[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.1235(a). We note that this section does not except from disclosure the amount or value of an

individual gift, grant, or donation. *See id.* § 552.1235(b). “Institution of higher education” is defined by section 61.003 of the Education Code. *Id.* § 552.1235(c). Section 61.003 defines an “institution of higher education” as any public technical institute, public junior college, public senior college or university, medical or dental unit, public state college, or other agency of higher education as defined in this section. *See Educ. Code* § 61.003. Because section 552.1235 does not provide a definition of “person,” we look to the definition provided in the Code Construction Act. *See Gov’t Code* § 311.005. “Person” includes a corporation, organization, government or governmental subdivision or agency, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, association, and any other legal entity. *Id.* § 311.005(2).

You have marked information that the system seeks to withhold under section 552.1235. We understand you to contend that the marked information either identifies or tends to identify two donors of the system. You state that these donors have not granted the system permission to reveal their identities. Based on your representations and our review of the information in question, we conclude that the system must withhold the information that you have marked under section 552.1235. We have marked additional information that must also be withheld on this basis.

In summary, the system may withhold the marked information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The system must withhold the information that you have marked, along with the additional information that we have marked, under section 552.1235 of the Government Code. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/eb

Ref: ID# 273968

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Colleen Reeves  
1629 LaMonte Lane  
Houston, Texas 77018  
(w/o enclosures)