



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 9, 2008

Mr. B. Chase Griffith
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2008-16745

Dear Mr. Griffith:

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# 329651.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received five requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a proposed concealed handgun class. You claim that portions of the submitted e-mails are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments received from a representative of the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that one of the e-mails submitted within Exhibit B is not responsive to the present request for information because it was created after the date the request was received. The town need not release non-responsive information in response to this request and this ruling will not address that information.

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 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 claim that the two e-mails submitted as Exhibit C constitute or reveal privileged communications between town attorneys and town officials, all of whom you have identified. You represent that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the town. You also represent that the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that section 552.107 is applicable to the e-mails within Exhibit C.

Section 552.137 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). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We have marked personal e-mail addresses within Exhibit B that must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of these e-mail addresses consent to their release. We note the requestor

has a right of access to his own e-mail addresses pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code.¹

In summary, the town may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The town must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of these addresses consent to their release. The remaining 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 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

¹See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("a person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests."); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). We note further that because the requestor has a special right of access to this information in this instance, the town must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

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/eeg

Ref: ID# 329651

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Ms. Virginia A. Moore
Law Offices of Virginia A. Moore
6021 Morriss Road, Suite 112
Morriss Road Office Park III
Flower Mound, Texas 75028-3764
(w/o enclosures)