



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 21, 2011

Ms. Evelyn W. Njuguna  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 368  
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2011-10439

Dear Ms. Njuguna:

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# 424567 (GC No. 18537).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for documents related to inspections and investigations during a specified time period pertaining to two specified properties and communications during a specified time period between two named individuals and the city's legal department. You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

You assert the information at issue is excepted from release pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 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 that the information at issue constitutes communications between city attorneys and various city employees in their capacities as clients that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to city employees. You state the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may generally withhold the submitted e-mails under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we note some of the submitted e-mail strings include communications with non-privileged parties. If the communications with these non-privileged parties, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold the communications with the non-privileged parties under section 552.107(1).

We note the non-privileged portions of the submitted e-mails include an e-mail address of a member of the public. Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 does not

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).*

appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that the individual whose e-mail address is at issue has affirmatively consented to the release of his e-mail address. Therefore, to the extent the city may not withhold the non-privileged portions of the submitted e-mail strings under section 552.107, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the city generally may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, to the extent the non-privileged e-mails we have marked exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they are submitted, the city must release this information, with the exception of the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 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](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,



Tamara H. Holland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

THH/bs

Ref: ID# 424567

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<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 opinion.