ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 20, 2006

Mr. Charles R. Kimbrough
Bickerstaff, Heath, Pollan, & Caroom, L.L.P.
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2006-07870

Dear Mr. Kimbrough:

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# 254603.

The City of Marble Falls (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents pertaining to the litigation and dismissal of the former city attorney. You indicate that you will provide some information to the requestor, but claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information contains the minutes of city council meetings. The minutes of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public by statute. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings), 551.043 (notice). Information made public by statute may not be withheld from the public under any of the Act's exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 544 (1990), 378 (1983), 161 (1977), 146 (1976). Accordingly, the submitted minutes, we have marked, must be released in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.

Next, we note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides, in pertinent part:

> [T]he 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). A portion of the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills. This information must be released under section 552.022 unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Section 552.107 is a discretionary exception under the Act and, therefore, does not constitute other law for the purposes of section 552.022. *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 discretionary exception); Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.107); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted attorney fee bills under section 552.107.

However, the Texas Supreme Court has determined 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); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 (2002), 677 (2002). Accordingly, we will address the confidentiality of the submitted attorney fee bills under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Texas Rule of Evidence 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 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: (1) must show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) must identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) must show 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 (2002). 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). *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, 4527 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You contend that the submitted attorney fee bills are privileged attorney-client communications. After reviewing your arguments and the information at issue, we believe that you have demonstrated some of the entries contained therein constitute confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Accordingly, we have marked the information in the submitted attorney fee bills that the city may withhold under Rule 503.

We will next address your argument that section 552.107 excepts the remaining information. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives,

lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "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). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that the remaining information constitutes confidential attorney-client communications between the city's elected Council, employees, staff, representatives, agents, and the city attorney's office. You further contend that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services and were intended to be confidential. Having considered these representations and the information at issue, we find that the city has established that the majority of the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to identify all of the parties to a portion of the remaining communications. Thus, you have failed to explain how the confidentiality of those communications was maintained. Accordingly, this information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.107, and the city must release the pages we have marked.

In summary, the marked city council minutes must be released in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. The city may withhold the information we have marked in the submitted attorney fee bills under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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).

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,

Michael A. Lehmann
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAL/sdk

Ref: ID# 254603

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Angela Timmons
The Highlander
304 Gateway Parkway
Marble Falls, Texas 78654
(w/o enclosures)