



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 3, 2011

Ms. Jenny Gravley  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2011-16186

Dear Ms. Gravley:

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# 435454.

The City of Richland Hills (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified address. You state the city will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 208*

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, 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)*. Further, although you also raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note section 552.107 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See ORD 676 at 1-2*.

at 1-2 (1978). The privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, *Evidence*, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5. The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You have marked information the city seeks to withhold on the basis of the informer’s privilege. You explain that the marked information identifies an individual who reported an alleged violation of a city ordinance to the city’s code enforcement department. You explain that the city’s code enforcement department is responsible for enforcing city ordinances. You inform us that a violation of the ordinance involved is a misdemeanor that is punishable by a fine. Based on your representations, we conclude that the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, the remaining information does not contain identifying information of the informer. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege.

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 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, 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). 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, orig. proceeding). 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 marked e-mails are communications between city attorneys and city staff. You have identified the parties to the communications. You state these communications were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city, were intended to be confidential, and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the marked information. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city also may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 435454

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)