



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 17, 2003

Ms. Lisa Aguilar
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2003-8223

Dear Ms. Aguilar:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191168.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for contracts with outside legal counsel for certain negotiations with Landry's Restaurants, Inc., and invoices and records of payments made to outside legal counsel for these negotiations. You advise that the city provided redacted copies of the submitted fee bills to the requestor. We note that your request for a decision does not address, nor did you submit, the requested contracts. We assume that the city has released this information to the extent that it exists. If not, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.021, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be released as soon as possible under circumstances). You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We note that the appropriate exception for a claim of attorney-client privilege under the Public Information Act (the "Act") is section 552.107(1). *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 4 (2002). Therefore, we have considered your claim under this exception and have reviewed the submitted information.

We note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

- (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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:

....

(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)(16). Under section 552.022, attorney fee bills must be released unless they are expressly confidential under other law. Section 552.107 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception under the Act and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. See Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.107. However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). This office has determined that when the attorney-client privilege is claimed for information that is subject to release under section 552.022, the proper analysis is whether the information at issue is excepted under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 5-6 (2002). Thus, we will consider whether any portion of the submitted information is excepted under rule 503.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) 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. See Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Thus, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the privileged information is 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 676.

We have marked those portions of the billing statements that reflect confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client pursuant to rule 503. The city may withhold this information. We find, however, that you have not demonstrated the applicability of rule 503 for the remaining highlighted information, either because it does not reflect confidential communications or because you have failed to identify the parties to the communications. *See Strong v. State*, 773 S.W.2d 543, 552 (Tex. Crim. App. 1989) (burden of establishing attorney-client privilege is on party asserting it). *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made; this office cannot necessarily assume that communication was made only among categories of individuals identified in rule 503), Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (stating that the Act places burden on governmental body to establish why and how exception applies to requested information). Consequently, the remaining highlighted 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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal 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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the


governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 appeal 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/lmt

Ref: ID# 191168

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Neal Falgoust
Corpus Christi Caller-Times
P.O. Box 9136
Corpus Christi, TX 78469
(w/o enclosures)