



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 25, 2010

Mr. John Knight  
Deputy City Attorney  
City of Denton  
215 East McKinney  
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2010-16150

Dear Mr. Knight:

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# 397916.

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for all correspondence received by either the city manager's office or the city's mayor during a specified period regarding proposed ordinance changes affecting gas drilling and production. You claim the portions of the submitted information you highlighted are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, 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). In this instance, your attorney-client and attorney work product privilege claims are properly addressed under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively.

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 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 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).

The submitted information consists of e-mail correspondence between individuals that are identified as city officials and attorneys. You represent these e-mails were communicated for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services to the city. You also state these e-mails were intended as confidential communications, and we understand they have remained confidential. Therefore, based on your representations and our review, we agree the information you highlighted is privileged, and the city may withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Some of the information you did not highlight consists of private e-mail addresses that may be subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> 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). The e-mail addresses we marked do not appear to be

---

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

excepted under subsection (c). Accordingly, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses we marked have consented to their release, the city must withhold these e-mail addresses under section 552.137.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the city may withhold the information you highlighted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners have consented to their release. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining raised exceptions to disclosure.

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](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,



Bob Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSD/tp

Ref: ID# 397916

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.