

October 4, 2023

Ms. Meredith Coffman Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General P.O. Box 12548 Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2023-34059

Dear Ms. Coffman:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. This request was originally received by the Open Records Division of this office and assigned ID# 23-084954 (Ref. No. R018507-060823). Preparation of this ruling has been re-assigned to the General Counsel Division.

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for information pertaining to specified complaints. The OAG states it will release most of the requested information with redactions allowed by law. The OAG claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. See Gov't Code § 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

¹ The OAG states, and provides documentation showing, it sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.2615. The requestor modified their request in response to the cost estimate. See id. § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also City of Dallas v. Abbott, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. Id. at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate 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). 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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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).

The OAG states the submitted information consists of draft letters which were created by, reviewed by, and discussed between attorneys of the Open Records Division. The OAG also states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the OAG. The OAG further states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the OAG has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the OAG may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

Ms. Meredith Coffman - Page 3

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Katie Stallcup Assistant Attorney General General Counsel Division

AKS/eb

Ref: ID# 23-084954

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor

(w/o enclosures)