



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 19, 2008

Ms. Julia Gannaway  
Lynn Pham & Ross, L.L.P.  
306 West Broadway Avenue  
Fort Worth, Texas 76104

OR2008-12938

Dear Ms. Gannaway:

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#322185.

The City of Colorado City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for monthly attorney expenses charged or paid for by the city for a specified period. You state that you are in the process of releasing a portion of the requested information. You claim that some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially we note, and you acknowledge, that the submitted attorney fee bills are subject to 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. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Although you claim this information is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that a governmental body may waive. Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.107 is not other law that makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a)(16) and therefore, the city

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

may not withhold the information under section 552.107. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the "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). Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503.

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 indicate that the submitted attorney fee bills include confidential communications between attorneys for the city and the city's employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also indicate that the communications were intended to be and remain confidential. However, you have failed to identify any of the parties to the communications in the submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made); *see generally* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (stating that predecessor to the Act places burden on governmental body to establish why and how exception applies to requested information); *Strong v. State*, 773 S.W.2d 543, 552 (Tex. Crim. App. 1989) (burden of establishing attorney-client privilege is on party asserting it). Nevertheless, we have been able to discern from the submitted documents that certain individuals are privileged parties. Therefore, we find that the information we have marked is protected by the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we determine that the city has failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining information constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis and as you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Christina Alvarado  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CA/jb

Ref: ID#322185

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Keith Hiser  
971 East 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Colorado City, Texas 79512  
(w/o enclosures)