



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 16, 2008

Ms. Carol Longoria  
Office of the General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2008-06713

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# 310257.

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for a named individual's personnel file, a specific statement, and any information pertaining to certain donations made to the university. You state that some of the information will be released to the requestor. You state that you have no information responsive to the third category of the request. We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.- San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.1235, and 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege, 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).

<sup>2</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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex.1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. Prior decisions of this office have found that personal financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy, but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), 373 (1983). In Open Records Decision No. 545, this office determined that a public employee’s allocation of his salary to a deferred compensation plan offered by his employer is a personal investment decision and certain information about the allocation is excepted from disclosure under the common-law right of privacy. Open Records Decision No. 545 at 4. Based on your representations and our review of the information in question, we conclude that you must withhold the personal financial information you have marked, as well as the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.107(1) 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 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). 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). 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

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments under constitutional privacy and section 552.136 of the Government Code for this information.

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 state that the information at Tab 6 consists of confidential e-mail communications between system attorneys and system administrators that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You also state that the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information you have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications that may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.1235 of the Government Code 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). An “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 at Tab 7 that you seek to withhold under section 552.1235. We understand you to contend that the marked information either identifies or tends to identify donors to the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas (UTSW). You state that the donors at issue have not granted UTSW permission to reveal their identities. Based on your representations and our review of the information in question, we conclude that you must withhold the information that you have marked under section 552.1235.

In summary, the system must withhold (1) the personal financial information it has marked, as well as the personal financial information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (2) the donor information it has marked under section 552.1235 of the Government Code. The system may withhold the e-mail correspondence it has included at Tab 6 as privileged attorney-client communications 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 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,



Bill Longley  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BL/eeg

Ref: ID# 310257

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Katie Fairbank  
Dallas Morning News  
508 Young Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202-4828  
(w/o enclosures)