ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 5, 2004

Mr. Joe A. De Los Santos
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246-0606

OR2004-2735

Dear Mr. De Los Santos:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197863.

The Schertz-Cibolo-Universal City Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for "all of Walsh's [attorney] billing statements." The district received a second request from the same requestor for "ALL attorney bills since last request." You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted documents consist of attorney fee bills and are subject to section 552.022(a) 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. Section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.107); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the district may not withhold the requested attorney fee bills under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You also raise the attorney-client privilege as encompassed in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.[1] The Texas Supreme Court has 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). Thus, we will determine whether any portion of the submitted information is protected from disclosure pursuant to the attorney-client privilege as encompassed by 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(b)(1). 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).

---

[1] The attorney-client privilege is properly raised under section 552.107, not section 552.101. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 3 (2002). Moreover, Texas Rule of Evidence 503 does not fall within the purview of section 552.101. *Id.* at 2.

To withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body: (1) must show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) must identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) must show 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under Rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege and the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 4527 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You contend that portions of the submitted fee bills are protected by the attorney-client privilege. Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information to this office, we find you have demonstrated that portions of the fee bills constitute confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Accordingly, we have marked the information the district may withhold under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor in accordance with section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,

Amy D. Peterson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 197863

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jane DuPlantis
3810 East FM 1518
St. Hedwig, Texas 78152
(w/o enclosures)