



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 18, 2016

Ms. Sandra D. Carpenter
General Counsel
Round Rock Independent School District
1311 Round Rock Avenue
Round Rock, Texas 78681

OR2016-18683

Dear Ms. Carpenter:

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# 622995 (TPIA No. 229).

The Round Rock Independent school district (the "district") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code, which provides:

(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:

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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 subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release this information 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 you seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure 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 6 (2002) (section 552.107(1) is not other law for purposes of section 552.022); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will address your claim of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Further, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your argument under this exception.

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 to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; 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. 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, orig. proceeding).

The district asserts the completed investigation must be withheld in its entirety under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The district informs us the information at issue was communicated between an attorney for the district and district employees in their capacities as clients. The district explains the information was created in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. The district states the information at issue was not intended for release to third parties, and the district states it has maintained the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney’s entire investigative report protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the district may withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.²

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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paige Lay".

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/akg

Ref: ID# 622995

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)