ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 28, 2005

Mr. Jerry E. Drake, Jr.
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2005-06790

Dear Mr. Drake:

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# 229177.

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for four categories of information related to an incident that occurred at the Kappa Alpha Psi Civic Center in April 1992. You state that you have released most of the requested information, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.[1] We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that Exhibit B consists of a completed report that is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

> 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:

[1]We note that the city also asserts the attorney-client privilege under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.107 is the proper exception for the city's claim of attorney-client privilege in this instance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002).

> (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022(a)(1), the city must release the completed report at issue unless it is confidential under "other law." Section 552.107 of the Government Code 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002) (governmental body may waive section 552.107); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). We note, however, that the attorney-client privilege is also found at rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address whether the information you have highlighted in Exhibit B may be withheld under rule 503. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 5-6 (2002).

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence 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). 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 information is privileged and 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).

In this instance, you state that the information you have highlighted in Exhibit B reveals a confidential attorney-client communication between the assistant city attorney and a city employee that were made in the furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. Furthermore, you assert that this communication was intended to be confidential and that its confidentiality has been maintained. Having considered your arguments and the information at issue, we agree that the information you have highlighted in Exhibit B is protected by the attorney-client privilege. Accordingly, you may withhold this information pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, we address your arguments under the attorney-client privilege for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See In re Texas 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 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. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), 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. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). 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 contend that the document comprising Exhibit C is protected by the attorney-client privilege. You explain that this document reveals confidential attorney-client communications between the assistant city attorney and city employees that were made in the furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. Furthermore, you assert that these communications were intended to be confidential and that their confidentiality has been maintained. Having considered your arguments and the information at issue, we agree that Exhibit C is protected by the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, the city may withhold this information pursuant to section 552.107(1).

In summary, the information you have highlighted in Exhibit B may be withheld under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Exhibit C may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the

Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 229177

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert Mack
P.O. Box 6432
Fort Worth, Texas 76115
(w/o enclosures)