



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 12, 2008

Mr. D. Craig Wood
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze, & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2008-12596

Dear Mr. Wood:

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# 321583.

The Northside Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all incoming and outgoing e-mails sent or received by a named individual on June 18, 2008. You claim that some of the submitted e-mails are not subject to the Act. You claim that portions of the submitted e-mails are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.116, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you claim that the e-mails labeled AG-0023 through AG-0027 are not subject to the Act. The Act is only applicable to "public information." See Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines public information as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it." *Id.* § 552.002(a). Information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under

¹Although the district raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, 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).

the Act if it is maintained for a governmental body, the governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information, and the information pertains to the transaction of official business. *See* Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987). After reviewing the information at issue, we agree that the e-mails labeled AG-0023 through AG-0027 do not constitute “information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the district. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.021; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Thus, we conclude that these e-mails are not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request.²

We now turn to your arguments regarding the e-mails that are subject to the Act. 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 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)-(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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of these e-mails.

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 e-mails labeled AG-0001 through AG-0022 are communications between district attorneys and district employees, all of whom you have identified. You inform this office that these communications were made in confidence and in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district, and that the communications have remained confidential. Based on our review of your representations and the submitted information, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, we conclude that the district may withhold the e-mails labeled AG-0001 through AG-0022 pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments regarding these e-mails.

You assert that the e-mail labeled AG-0030 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.116 of the Government Code. Section 552.116 provides as follows:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) 'Audit' means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) 'Audit working paper' includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You contend that the e-mail labeled AG-0030 is an audit working paper subject to section 552.116. However, you fail to explain how this e-mail was prepared or maintained in connection with any specific audit. Accordingly, we find that you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.116 to the e-mail labeled AG-0030; thus, this e-mail may not be withheld under this exception. As you raise no other exceptions regarding this e-mail, it must be released to the requestor.

You assert that the e-mail labeled AG-0029 contains information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). An access device number is one that may be used to (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value, or (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument, and includes an account number. *Id.* § 552.136(a). In this instance, you do not provide any arguments explaining how the web address you have marked can be used to obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value. Further, you do not explain that this address can be used to initiate a transfer of funds. Accordingly, we find that you have failed to explain the applicability of section 552.136 to the information you have marked. As no other exceptions are raised with regard to AG-0029, this e-mail must be released to the requestor.

In summary, the e-mails labeled AG-0023 through AG-0027 are not subject to the Act. The district may withhold the e-mails labeled AG-0001 through AG-0022 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining e-mails 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). 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,



Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/jh

Ref: ID# 321583

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Raymond Tamayo
10734 Vollmer Lane
San Antonio, Texas 78254-1757
(w/o enclosures)