



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 19, 2012

Mr. Andrew B. Thompson  
Assistant General Counsel  
Corpus Christi Independent School District  
P.O. Box 110  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-0110

OR2012-11245

Dear Mr. Thompson:

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# 459354.

The Corpus Christi Independent School District (the "district") received a request for (1) all documents reviewed or prepared in connection with the district's administration's case against a specified employee, (2) a list of the witnesses interviewed by the district in regards to the specified employee's denial of leave benefits, and (3) all notes, e-mails, and telephone records concerning the specified employee's denial of leave benefits. You state some of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, 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). We also note, section 552.101 does not encompass rule 1.05 of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct.

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 only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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 made in furtherance of professional legal services rendered to the district. You state these communications were exchanged between the district’s staff attorneys and district staff and contain the staff attorneys’ legal advice and strategies. You state these communications were intended to be confidential and that 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. Accordingly, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kathryn R. Mattingly". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Kathryn R. Mattingly  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KRM/dls

Ref: ID# 459354

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)