



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 15, 2014

Ms. Catherine Brown Fryer
Counsel for the City of South Padre Island
Bickerstaff Heath Delgado Acosta, LLP
3711 South MoPac Expressway, Building One, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2014-22693

Dear Ms. Fryer:

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# 547591.

The City of South Padre Island (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) all documentation regarding a specified investigation, (2) all invoices submitted by a named attorney showing whether the invoices were submitted for conducting investigative work or work as an attorney, and (3) the total amount paid by taxpayer money for the named attorney's services rendered to investigate the complaint at issue. The city states it has released some of the requested information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city raises sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code for this information, these exceptions are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1)), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 or 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the city’s assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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 it is 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).

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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 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. *Id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication 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). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege extends to entire communication, including factual information).

The city states the submitted information consists of communications involving city attorneys, city representatives, and other city employees. The city states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has established the information at issue constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may generally withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

However, we note one of the submitted e-mails includes attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if these attachments are removed from the e-mail and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the city maintains these non-privileged attachments, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail to which they are attached, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged attachments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. In that event, as the city raises no other exceptions to disclosure for the information at issue, the city must release the non-privileged attachments.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 547591

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)