



September 30, 2002

Ms. Kimberly S. Moore  
Strasburger & Price, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 4300  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3794

OR2002-5482

Dear Ms. Moore:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 169941.

The Cedar Hill Independent School District (the “district”), which you represent, received a request for legal fees incurred by the district from April 15, 2002 to July 9, 2002 pertaining to the proposed termination of a named individual. You inform us that as of the date of the request, the district did not have bills for the period July 1, 2002 to July 9, 2002. The Public Information Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). Of the responsive information that did exist on the date of the request, you inform us that the district has released this information to the requestor, with portions redacted. You argue that the redacted portions are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code, as well as under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

At the outset, we must address the district’s obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, a governmental

---

<sup>1</sup>You have also redacted information that you deem to not be responsive to the request, which you have bracketed in the information submitted for our review. Therefore, our ruling is limited to the information that is responsive to the request.

body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why any stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You did not, however, submit to this office a copy of the request for information.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Section 552.107 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception under the Public Information Act and does not demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information from the public. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Accordingly, none of the information may be withheld under sections 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, we note that the submitted information constitutes information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Under section 552.022, attorney fee bills must be released unless they are expressly confidential under other law. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). We note that the Supreme Court did not hold that the Texas Disciplinary Rules

of Professional Conduct are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. Thus, we will determine only whether the submitted information is excepted under Rule 503.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503. A communication is "confidential" if 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the document containing privileged information is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

After review of your arguments and the submitted documents, we agree that much of the information in the submitted fee bills that you have highlighted consists of confidential communications protected by the attorney-client privilege and Rule 503. We have marked the information to be withheld. We note, however, that some of the information in the submitted fee bills involves communications to or between individuals who we are unable to identify as employees of the district, the district's outside counsel, or representatives of these parties. Accordingly, we are unable to conclude that communications involving such unidentified individuals are protected by the attorney-client privilege, and thus, this information must be released.

To summarize, the district may withhold the information we have marked under Rule 503. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325.

Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Michael A. Pearle  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAP/jh

Ref: ID# 169941

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mark Robinett  
Brim, Arnett & Robinett  
2525 Wallingwood Drive  
Building 14  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)