



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 16, 2011

Ms. Constance K. Acosta
For City of League City
Ross, Banks, May, Cron & Cavin, P.C.
2 Riverway, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77056

OR2011-11803

Dear Ms. Acosta:

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# 427062 (PIR #11-185).

The City of League City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified comments from three consultants regarding revisions to an oil and gas ordinance. You state the city has provided two of the consultants' comments to the requestor. You claim the submitted consultant comments are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege found in rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, 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). In this instance, section 552.107 is the proper exception to raise for your attorney-client privilege claim and section 552.111 is the proper exception to raise for your attorney work product privilege claim. Additionally, although you also raise section 552.103 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure of the submitted information, you have provided no arguments regarding the applicability of this section. We, therefore, assume you no longer assert section 552.103. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(b), (e), .302.

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. *See* 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. *See 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 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. *See* 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. *See 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 the submitted e-mail, memorandum, and red-lined ordinances consist of communications between city officials and an attorney consulting for the city made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also state the communications were made in confidence and the confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Thus, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Leah B. Wingerson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/dls

Ref: ID# 427062

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)