



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 24, 2008

Mr. Humberto Aguilera
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
P.O. Box 200
San Antonio, Texas 78291-0200

OR2008-13137

Dear Mr. Aguilera:

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# 324642.

The Webb County Appraisal District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a legal opinion given to the district's Appraisal Review Board (the "board") regarding the appointment of a particular individual to the board. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address the requestor's assertion that the district failed to meet its procedural obligations under the Act. Specifically, the requestor asserts that she made a prior request for the information at issue on July 9, 2008, and that the district failed to either provide the requested information or submit the request to this office for a decision within the required ten business days. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(b)* (a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request). A governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. *Gov't Code § 552.302*. In her initial request, the requestor sought any opinion rendered by an attorney "before the directors voted" on the board member. The district states that an attorney rendered an opinion to the board "after the board voted" on the appointment. Accordingly, we conclude that the submitted information was not responsive to the requestor's initial request. The district has timely requested a ruling from our office with regard to the requestor's second request. Thus, we conclude that the district complied with its obligations under the Act, and accordingly we will address its arguments pertaining to the submitted information.

You assert the submitted information is excepted under section 552.107 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)*. 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 a *confidential* communication, *id.*, 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 inform us that the submitted information consists of a communication between the district’s legal counsel and a district administrator regarding the subject of the appointment of an individual to the district’s board. You assert that this communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services, that it was intended to be confidential, and that its confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree the submitted information constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication that the district may withhold 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). 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,



Emily Sitton
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EBS/eeg

Ref: ID# 324642

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rose Cruz
108 Norman Drive
Laredo, Texas 78045
(w/o enclosures)