



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 30, 2014

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
Law Department
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2014-07209

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 521239.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for all e-mail, memoranda, or other documents regarding three specified topics and the city's policy on record retention. We understand the city will release some information to the requestor. You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the portion of the request seeking the city's policy on record retention. Although you state the city has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the types of information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the types of information you have

¹We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of Gov't Code § 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Accordingly, to the extent the requested policy existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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 in order to withhold the information at issue. 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. 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). Third, the privilege applies only to 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 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. *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 information you have marked consists of confidential communications between individuals you have identified as city attorneys and city staff. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services and the

confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, 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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 521239

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²We note the information being released contains the requestor's e-mail address. See Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The requestor has a right of access to his e-mail address under section 552.137(b). See *id.* § 552.137(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 without requesting a decision. Thus, should the city receive another request for the information at issue from a different requestor, the city is authorized to withhold the requestor's e-mail address without requesting another ruling.