



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 3, 2008

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

OR2008-14993

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# 327199.

The City of Colorado City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for several categories of information pertaining to expenditures for legal services for a specified period of time. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.136 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides in part that:

- (a) 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:

¹We 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.

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code. § 552.022(a)(3), (16). In this instance, the submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the expenditure of public funds as well as attorney fee bills. Thus, the city must release this information pursuant to subsections 552.022(a)(3) and 552.022(a)(16) unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Section 552.107 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* 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 the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Further, section 552.136 of the Government Code is "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, as well as your arguments under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and 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.

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 fee bills include confidential communications between city employees and its attorneys for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find that you have established that portions of the submitted fee bills constitute privileged attorney-client communications; therefore, the city may withhold those portions that we have marked under rule 503. However, the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information constitutes confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). An access device number is one that may be used to “(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). We note that because check numbers do not constitute access device numbers, section 552.136 is not applicable to this information. Upon review of the information you have marked, we find that a portion of this information, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. For the remaining information you have marked, you have failed to demonstrate this information constitutes an access device number used to obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value or initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer

originated solely by paper instrument. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold the remaining information it has marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked in the submitted fee bills under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 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 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,



Bill Dobie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WJD/jh

Ref: ID# 327199

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Connie Ponko
430 ECR 141
Colorado City, Texas 79512
(w/o enclosures)