



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 8, 2010

Ms. Bridget Chapman  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Georgetown  
P.O. Box 409  
Georgetown, Texas 78627

OR2010-18421.

Dear Ms. Chapman:

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# 402228.

The City of Georgetown (the "city") received a request for all e-mails exchanged with outside counsel regarding a specified ordinance about the 2003 City Charter amendments. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Section 552.107 is the applicable law in this instance.

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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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 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).

You state the submitted information consists of confidential communications between the city attorney, the former city attorney, and outside legal counsel that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city. Although you have failed to identify the parties to the communications, we are able to discern from the face of the documents that certain individuals are privileged parties. We find the city may withhold the information we have marked in the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the some of remaining e-mails are communications with an attorney employed by the Texas Municipal League (the “league”). We note the league’s website states these attorneys only provide general legal advice, and do not actually represent member cities. Further, the remaining e-mails are between employees of the Secretary of State or between other individuals you have not identified. Because you have not demonstrated that any of these outside parties are privileged parties, we find you have failed to establish that the remaining information constitutes or documents privileged attorney-client communications. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains an e-mail address 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).<sup>2</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its disclosure.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its disclosure. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Sarah Casterline  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SEC/eeg

---

<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. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>We note this office 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 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Ref: ID# 402228

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)