



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 17, 2012

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Attorney and Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78704-2902

OR2012-11007

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code, the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Your request was assigned ID# 459755 (OGC #143553).

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the "university") received a request for documents regarding "the contract with Paul Hastings LLP; price and payment of services provided by Paul Hastings LLP; and hiring of Paul Hastings LLP from Oct. 1, 2011, to [the] present." The university claims the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The university also notified Paul Hastings of the request to permit it to submit comments to this office as an interested party. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information). We have considered the exception the university claims and reviewed the submitted sample of information.¹ We have also considered Paul Hastings' comments, which supports the university's assertion of the attorney-client privilege.

Initially, we note some of the documents are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are

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.

public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

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

Id. § 552.022(a)(3). Some of the documents relate to receipt or expenditure of funds by the university and are subject to section 552.022(a)(3). Thus, they are excepted from disclosure only if they are confidential under the Act or other law. Although the university raises section 552.107, this exception is discretionary in nature and thus may be waived. Accordingly, section 552.107 does not constitute other law for purposes of section 552.022. *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). Therefore, the university may not withhold these documents under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are other laws within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider whether the university may withhold these documents subject to 552.022(a)(3) under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 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 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 it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and 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).

The university states the documents at issue are communications between its attorneys and clients that were made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the clients. The university also states the communications were intended to be confidential and have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties. Thus, we agree the university may withhold the documents subject to section 552.022(a)(3) pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Next, we consider the university’s section 552.107 assertion for the remaining information. 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). 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 Texas 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 a 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, orig. proceeding). 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).

The university states the remaining information consists of communications between university attorneys and clients. Furthermore, the university states the communications were intended to be confidential, and the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Upon review, we find the university may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university may withhold the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/bs

Ref: ID# 459755

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. Kenneth Breen, JD
Paul Hastings LLP
75 East 55th Street
New York, New York 10022
(w/o enclosures)