



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 9, 2010

Ms. Molly Shortall
Assistant City Attorney
City of Arlington
P.O. Box 90231
Arlington, Texas 76004-3231

OR2010-02002

Dear Ms. Shortall:

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# 369768.

The City of Arlington (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified location during a specified time period. You state that you have released most of the requested information. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted 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 must provide 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

¹ Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 1-2 (1990). In addition, because the information for which you claim this provision is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the information is properly addressed here under section 552.107 rather than rule 503. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 8-9 (2002); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022 (listing categories of information that are expressly public under the Act and must be released unless confidential under "other law").

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). 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 is protected 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 pet.). 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 the governmental body otherwise waives the privilege. *See Hie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that a portion of the submitted information consists of communications made for the purpose of facilitating legal services and that the communications are exclusively between city lawyers and city employees, a list of whom you have provided. You state these communications were made in confidence and the city has maintained their confidentiality. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

We note the information you have marked for release includes e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, which 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 *See Gov’t*

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.137 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked in the information being released are not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, the e-mail addresses we have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.³ *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, other than the information it has marked for release, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owners of the addresses have consented to their release. The remaining information must be released.⁴

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James McGuire
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JM/cc

³We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

⁴We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has a special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). Because such information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

Ref: ID# 369768

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)