ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 29, 2014

Mr. J. Grady Randle
Counsel for the City of Brazos Country
Randle Law Office Ltd., L.L.P.
820 Gessner, Suite 1570
Houston, Texas 77024-4494

OR2014-01675

Dear Mr. Randle:

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# 512012.

The City of Brazos Country (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified letter to the city from the requestor and a specified request for a variance. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of 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. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *Id.* § 552.107(1). 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 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 to only 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 to only 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, orig. proceeding). 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 Exhibit B constitutes communications between attorneys for the city and city officials and employees in their capacity as clients that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Thus, the city may generally withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1). We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1).

To the extent the non-privileged e-mails we have marked in Exhibit B are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, portions of the non-privileged e-mails, as well as portions of Exhibit C, are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.[1] Section 552.137 of 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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an

[1]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Internet website address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, or an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees. The e-mail addresses we have marked are not of the types specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the non-privileged portions of the e-mails we have marked if they are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information.[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.

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,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/tch

---

[2]We note the requestor has a right of access to her own personal e-mail address in the information that is being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b) (personal e-mail address of member of public may be disclosed if owner of address affirmatively consents to its disclosure). We also note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the city receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have such a right of access, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the city to redact this requestor's personal e-mail address. *See* ORD 684.

Ref: ID# 512012

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)