



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 23, 2007

Mr. James R. Evans, Jr.
Hargrove & Evans, LLP
4425 Mopac South
Building 3, Suite 400
Austin, Texas 78735

OR2007-04570

Dear Mr. Evans:

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# 276281.

The Fannin County Appraisal District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any and all records relating to the property tax accounts of the City of Bonham and the County of Fannin which have been totally or partially forgiven, waived, charged-off, deleted, or otherwise not collected as a result of the request of a named organization, any and all records showing or tending to show that changing tax attorneys will cause the taxing entity to lose money or cost the taxing entity money, and any and all documents which confirm or deny the requestor's information. You claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We

¹Although you assert the attorney-client privilege exception under section 552.022 of the Government Code, section 552.022 provides a list of eighteen categories of information that are expressly public and may not be withheld unless confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022. Thus, section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. The proper exception to raise for the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002). Thus, we will consider your argument under this exception.

have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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 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).

²We 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.

You state that the information at issue consists of communications between district personnel and the district's law firm pertaining to recommended courses of action with regard to delinquent property taxes. We agree that this information was made for the purpose of rendering legal services to the district. We understand you to assert that these communications were intended to be confidential, and that this confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information you have marked is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We therefore conclude the district may withhold the marked information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jordan Johnson".

Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/eb

Ref: ID# 276281

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Billy R. Gant
411 North Main
Bonham, Texas 75418
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles M. Shannon
Fannin County Appraisal District
831 West State Hwy 56
Bonham, Texas 75418
(w/o enclosures)