



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 17, 2005

Ms. Carol Longoria  
The University of Texas System  
Office of General Counsel  
201 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2005-09396

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 234312.

The University of Texas System (the "system") received two requests for information pertaining to specific audits and information pertaining to the system and a specific law firm, including contracts, agreements, opinions, reports, and any derivative records related to the reports. You inform us that you have released some of the information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note, and you acknowledge, that Tab 4 is a completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under other law. Tab 4 must therefore be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is expressly made confidential under other law. Section 552.107 of the Government Code, which excepts information within the attorney-client privilege, is a discretionary exception under the Public Information Act and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. Open Records Decision No. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)).

However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. 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). Thus, we will determine whether Tab 4 is confidential under Rule 503.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

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.

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. Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication 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 [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

The system states Tab 4 is a communication between the system and its attorney made in the furtherance of rendition of legal services. The system further explains the document was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Hence, we agree the system may withhold Tab 4 pursuant to Rule 503.

Next, we consider the system's section 552.107 assertion for Tab 6. 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). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for Rule 503. The system states the email message and document in Tab 6 are communications between the system attorney and the system made in the furtherance of rendition of legal services. The system further explains both communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Hence, we agree the system may withhold Tab 6 pursuant to section 552.107. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

In summary, you may withhold Tab 4 pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Tab 6 pursuant to section 552.107 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, 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); *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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Jaime L. Flores  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLF/seg

Ref: ID# 234312

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Zachary Warmbrodt  
2405 Rio Grande Street, #9  
Austin, Texas 78705  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Tresaugue  
Houston Chronicle  
801 Texas Avenue  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)