



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 28, 2014

Ms. Susan K. Bohn
Assistant Superintendent and General Counsel
Lake Travis Independent School District
3322 Ranch Road 620 South
Austin, Texas 78738

OR2014-09083

Dear Ms. Bohn:

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# 524128 (LTISD Ref. Nos. 030314-1009/DL4908, 030314-100B/DL4910, 030314-1--C-FEC/DL4911, 030314-1017/DL4922).

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district") received four requests from the same requestor for (1) billing statements, invoices, and receipts for the district's legal expenses during a specified time period; (2) documents regarding any resignations or terminations of any district employee or contractor during a specified time period; (3) any employee exit interview documents created or submitted during a specified time period; and (4) any approved settlement or mediation agreements approved, signed, or executed during a specified time period. You inform us you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. Additionally, you inform us you have redacted information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code, and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. You also assert release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state you notified the third party of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305

permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered your claims and reviewed the submitted information.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any third party explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest a third party may have in it.

We next note the information in Tab 1 is subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for 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 confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Tab 1 consists of attorney fee bills. Section 552.107 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *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 district may not withhold the fee bills under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held 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 assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the fee bills submitted in Tab 1. We will also consider the remaining arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege, providing in relevant part:

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 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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You assert the submitted attorney fee bills must be withheld in their entirety under rule 503. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides 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 Nos. 676 (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, the district may not withhold the entirety of the submitted fee bills under rule 503.

You state the attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between the district's outside attorneys and district officials and personnel. You state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. Further, we understand these communications have remained confidential. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, the remaining information at issue does not document a communication or consists of communications with parties whom you have not established are privileged parties for purposes of rule 503. Therefore, none of the remaining information in Tab 1 may be withheld under rule 503.

Next, we address the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82.

The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office also has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542, 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation or public employees), 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the information you have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district must release the remaining submitted information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 524128

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)