



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 31, 2008

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P. O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2008-10406

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 317371.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for e-mails sent or received since January 1, 2008 by two named individuals which mention the city's visitor's center. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have submitted information that is not responsive to the request. In this instance, you have submitted information outside the time period specified by the requestor. Therefore, this information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the request. This ruling does not address the non-responsive information.

You claim that the e-mails contained within Exhibit B are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) 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).

¹Although you initially raised section 552.101 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how this exception applies to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn this exception. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, 552.302.

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, lawyer representatives, and lawyers representing another party in a pending action concerning a matter of common interest therein. 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).

You claim that the submitted e-mails in Exhibit B reveal or reflect confidential communications to and from the city attorney’s office. You indicate that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services and that the communications have remained confidential. Therefore, based on your representations and our review, we find that the communications in Exhibit B are protected under the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail

address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).² Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public," but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do inform us that the relevant members of the public have not consented to the release of these e-mail addresses. Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked, in addition to those we have marked, under section 552.137.

We note that some of the remaining submitted information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The city may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Thus, if the individual at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individual did not make a timely election to keep his personal information confidential.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individual at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential. Unless it receives consent for their release, the city must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive 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

²While you cite section 552.136 of the Government Code for your argument to withhold e-mail addresses, we understand you to raise section 552.137 of the Government Code, as section 552.137 is the proper exception for the substance of your argument.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 317371

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Karen Boren
Assistant News Director
KJTV Fox 34
9800 University Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79423
(w/o enclosures)