



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 23, 2007

Mr. Raymond L. Telles
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso, Office of the City Attorney
2 Civic Center Plaza, 9th Floor
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2007-06459

Dear Mr. Telles:

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# 279646.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for various documents, including billing invoices, from two outside law firms hired to represent the city. You state that you will provide the requestor with some of the requested information. You claim, however, that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your argument and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you note that some of the information responsive to the present request was the subject of a previous ruling by this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2005-06142 (2005), we held that the city may withhold portions of the information submitted in that instance under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Therefore, assuming that the four criteria for a "previous determination" established by this office in Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) have been met, we conclude that the city may continue to rely on our decision in Open Records Letter No. 2005-06142 with respect to the information requested in this instance that was previously ruled upon in that decision.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.301(f); Open Records Decision No. 673.

¹ The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, that the submitted attorney fee bills are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides for the required public disclosure of “information that is in a bill for attorney’s fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege,” unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16). The Texas Supreme Court has held that the “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). Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503.

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 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 attorney fee bills document communications between attorneys for the city and the city's employees. You state that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city, and that such communications were not intended for disclosure to third persons. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we have marked the information that the city may withhold under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We find, however, that the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication. As you raise no further exceptions against the disclosure of this information, it 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, 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/mcf

Ref: ID# 279646

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Teresa S. Montoya
Montoya PR
154 North Festival, Villa F
El Paso, Texas 79912
(w/o enclosures)