ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 6, 2005

Ms. Kathryn H. Davis
City Attorney
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2005-04922

Dear Ms. Davis:

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# 225467.

The City of Killeen (the "city") received two requests for information related to the city's purchase of a telephone system, including investigative reports regarding the procurement process. You state that you have released some responsive information, but you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

> 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:
>
> > (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 internal audit report and its attachment. Because the submitted information consists of a completed report, as prescribed by section 552.022, the city must release the submitted information unless it is confidential under other law. Sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government

Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002) (governmental body may waive section 552.107); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney-client and attorney work product privileges are also found, respectively, at rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, we will consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information pursuant to rules 503 and 192.5.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence 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. *Id.* 503(a)(5). Thus, in order 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. 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).

You state that the submitted information consists of a communication between the city attorney and the then finance director that was made for the purpose of rendering legal services to the city concerning a matter of potential legal liability to the city. You indicate that this communication was intended to be confidential, and that confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the submitted information is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We therefore conclude the city may withhold the submitted information pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.[1]

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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).

---

[1]As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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); *Tex. 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,

Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/seg

Ref: ID# 225467

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lisa Soule
1505 Port Drive
Harker Heights, Texas 76548
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sarah Chacko
Killeen Daily Herald
P.O. Box 1300
Killeen, Texas 76540
(w/o enclosures)