



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 17, 2011

Mr. Warren M.S. Ernst
Chief of the General Counsel Division
Office of the City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2011-08675

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 421600.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for (1) all city records and correspondence from January 10, 2011 through the date of the request pertaining to a specified address and (2) all correspondence between a named individual and all of the following: building official and her designees; building inspection district offices; code enforcement; and two named individuals. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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

¹This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested information to the extent that the other information is substantially different than that submitted to this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

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 to only communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. 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 to only 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 information in Exhibit B constitutes confidential attorney-client communications amongst city employees and the city’s legal counsel that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You also state that the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained so. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part the following:

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information in Exhibit B.

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In this instance, you state, and provide documentation representing that, litigation is currently pending in the matter of *State of Texas v. Alan J. Eynon*, Case No. C16-117439-13, which pertains to a violation on the requestor's property of the Dallas City Code and is currently scheduled for trial with the city's Department of Court and Detention Services. You state further that the information in Exhibit C is related to the pending litigation because it concerns the subject matter of the litigation. Based upon your representations and our review, we agree litigation to which the city is a party was pending on the date the city received the present request. Furthermore, we find that the information contained in Exhibit C is related to the pending litigation. Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

We note, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further,

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information in Exhibit C.

the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, and may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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,



Kirsten Brew
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB/em

Ref: ID# 421600

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)