



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 10, 2008

Ms. Carol Longoria
Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78751

OR2008-04800

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 306981.

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for thirteen categories of information related to the expulsion of a student from a system band camp. You indicate that you will provide the requestor with some of the requested information. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 1.05 of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Thus, we will not address your claim that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with either of these rules.

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.

comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments concerning availability of requested information).

Initially, we address the comments submitted by the requestor. The requestor states that the system failed to timely respond to previous requests for information contained in e-mail communications between the requestor's client and the system. The requestor provided copies of these e-mail communications. Upon review of the communications, we determine that the e-mails were not sent to the system's public information officer or the officer's designee. *See id.* § 552.301(c) (stating that a written request includes a request in writing that is sent to the officer for public information, or the person designated by that officer, by e-mail or facsimile). Thus, we find that the system did not violate the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code by not responding to these e-mail communications. *See generally, id.* § 552.301 (enumerating the responsibilities a governmental body incurs upon receipt of a written request for information that it wishes to withhold). Accordingly, we will address the system's claims under section 552.107.

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 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 Inc. 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)-(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, 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 have submitted emails between system employees and a system attorney. You state the system attorney "received and responded to these communications in his capacity as University counsel and provided professional legal services to the School of Music regarding the Camp incident." Upon review, we agree that the system may withhold the communications under section 552.107.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/jb

Ref: ID# 306981

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. H. Glenn Hall, III
Attorney at Law
4408 Spicewood Springs Road
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)