



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 15, 2008

Ms. Mia Settle
Staff Counsel
Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department
49 San Jacinto
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2008-12644

Dear Ms. Settle:

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# 321996.

The Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (the "department") received a request for (1) e-mails pertaining to a named individual since November 1, 2007 and (2) e-mails pertaining to the requestor's interview request during a specified time frame.¹ You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that some of the responsive information is not subject to the Act. You also claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.²

You claim that the information responsive to category one of the request is not subject to the Act because it is being held on behalf of the judiciary. The Act generally requires the disclosure of information maintained by a "governmental body." *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. While the Act's definition of a "governmental body" is broad, it specifically excludes "the judiciary." *See id.* § 552.003(1)(A), (B). In Open Records Decision No. 646 (1996), this

¹We note that the department received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

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.

office determined that a community supervision and corrections department is a governmental body for purposes of the Act, and that its administrative records, such as personnel records and other records reflecting day-to-day management decisions, are subject to the Act. *Id.* at 5. However, we also ruled that specific records regarding individuals on probation and subject to the direct supervision of a court that are held by a community supervision and corrections department are not subject to the Act because such records are held on behalf of the judiciary. *Id.*; see Gov't Code § 552.003.

In this instance, you state that the information responsive to category one of the request "consists of probationer records." Therefore, based upon your representation, we find that these records are held by the department on behalf of the judiciary and are not subject to disclosure under the Act. See ORD 646 at 2-3; *Benavides v. Lee*, 665 S.W.2d 151 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1983, no writ) (in determining whether governmental entity falls within judiciary exception, this office looks to whether governmental entity maintains relevant records as agent of judiciary with regard to judicial, as opposed to administrative, functions).

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

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 you have marked consists of confidential communications between department employees and the department's general counsel, and you have specifically identified each of the individuals at issue. You also state that these communications were made in confidence and in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the department. We understand that the communications have remained confidential. Based on our review of your representations and the submitted communications, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.317(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Likewise, section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. The department must withhold the personal e-mail address that you have marked under section 552.137 unless the owner has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure.

In summary, the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the personal e-mail address that it has marked under section 552.137 unless the owner has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. The remaining information that is subject to the Act 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 from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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# 321996

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ted Oberg
KTRK-TV/ ABC 13
3310 Bissonnet
Houston, Texas 77005
(w/o enclosures)