



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 29, 2013

Ms. Jordan Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Assistant Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
General Counsel Division
Post Office Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2013-15137

Dear Ms. Hale:

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 originally received by the Open Records Division of the Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") and assigned ID# 501834. Preparation of the ruling has been assigned to the Opinion Committee of this office.

The OAG received a request for all records concerning ID# 492612 and OR2013-11614. You indicate that you will release some information. You claim that the remainder of the responsive information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information you have submitted under Exhibit B.

Section 552.107(1) 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. Tex. Att'y Gen. ORD-676 (2002) at 6-7. 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, such as acting as an administrator, investigator, or manager. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (stating that the attorney-client “privilege does not apply if the attorney is acting in a capacity other than that of an attorney”), *mand. denied*, 12 S.W.3d 807 (Tex. 2000). 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). 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, 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, orig. proceeding [mand. denied]). 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. *See* Tex. Att’y Gen. ORD-676 (2002) at 10–11. 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) (orig. proceeding) (stating that the privilege extends to an “entire communication, including facts contained therein”).

You state that the entirety of information submitted under Exhibit B consists of or reveals internal communications between OAG attorneys and personnel made for the purpose of providing professional legal services to the OAG. You explain that the information includes an email between OAG attorneys and personnel, internal ORD tracking sheets and a draft of an ORD letter ruling. You also explain that the tracking sheets “serve as part of the communication between OAG attorneys and are used in the process of drafting, reviewing, editing, and revising draft letter rulings before their issuance in final form.” You further state that they are used “by OAG attorneys to communicate their legal advice and opinions,” and that “these communications were not intended to be disclosed and have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties.” Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that the information you have provided under Exhibit B is subject to the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. As this ruling is dispositive of the entirety of the information submitted in your request, 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Charlotte M. Harper
Assistant Attorney General
Opinion Committee

CMH/sdk

Ref: ID# 501834

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)