



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 5, 2008

Mr. Blake E. Armstrong
Birdsong & Armstrong, P.C.
211 East Houston
Tyler, Texas 75702

OR2008-03008

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

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# 304011.

The City of Eustace (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to the city's expenditures, including legal expenditures from fiscal year 2003 through the present. You state that some of the information has been released to the requestor. However, you claim that the submitted information is privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ We have considered the argument you make and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note and you acknowledge, that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides that the following category of information is public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless it is 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[.]

¹ Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege, 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).

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). In this instance, the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills. Therefore, the information must be released under section 552.022 unless it is confidential under other law. 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 consider your argument under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 with respect to the information in the attorney fee bills.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. 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).

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).

You state that the submitted attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between the city's attorneys and the city that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. However, you have not identified any of the parties to the communications at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information). From our review of the submitted information, we have been able to identify some of these unidentified individuals as city employees or attorneys. Accordingly, based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the attorney fee bills contain information that reveals confidential communications between privileged parties. You assert that in such a situation, the attorney fee bills must be withheld in their entirety. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides that information "that is *in* a bill for attorney's fees" is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See also* Open Records Decisions No. 676 (2002) (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)); 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney's legal advice). Accordingly, we have marked the information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and may therefore be withheld pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, because you did not identify the other individuals involved in the communications, the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information documents privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. As you raise no other exceptions against the disclosure of this information, it 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Chanita Chantaplin-McLelland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CC/mcf

Ref: ID# 304011

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Mark Sanders
409 Walker Street
Eustace, Texas 75124
(w/o enclosures)