ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 16, 2007

Ms. Ellen H. Spalding
Feldman & Roger, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2007-15134

Dear Ms. Spalding:

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# 295099.

The Klein Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for specified types of information reflecting the expenditure of public funds relating to general counsel and outside counsel for the district, as well as information pertaining to a specified special education due process hearing.[1] The district states that it does not have documents responsive to a portion of the request.[2] It further states that it will provide some information responsive to the latter portion of the request to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.[3] We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also

---

[1]The district informs this office the requestor subsequently clarified her request. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request).

[2]We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

[3]Although you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Texas Rules of Evidence, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). We further note that, although you raise sections 552.103, 552.117, and 552.136, you provide no explanation of how these exceptions are applicable to the submitted information. Accordingly, no part of the submitted information may be withheld on these bases. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the submitted attorney fee bills are subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides for the required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege," unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(16). 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). The attorney-client privilege is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of this privilege under rule 503 with respect to the information in the attorney fee bills.

Texas Rule of Evidence 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).

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 assert that the submitted attorney fee bills may be withheld in their entirety. You explain that they constitute communications between attorneys for the district and district employees. You further state that the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and that they were not intended to be disclosed to third parties. We disagree with your assertion that the fee bills are excepted in their entirety and we have marked the information that the district may withhold on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, no part of the remaining information that is subject to 552.022(a)(16) may be withheld on this basis.

You next assert that the information at Tab F may be withheld under section 552.107. Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107. 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 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. 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 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)(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. *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 explain that the documents submitted at Tab F consist of communications between attorneys for the district and district representatives, as well as between attorneys for the district. You state that these communications were made for the rendition of professional legal services and that confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Upon review, we determine that the district may withhold the information submitted at Tab F pursuant to section 552.107.[4]

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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, 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

---

[4]As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we do not address your arguments under section 552.111 or section 552.137.

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,



Kara A. Batey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/jh

Ref: ID# 295099

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Angela Harris
4710 Havenwoods Drive
Houston, Texas 77066
(w/o enclosures)