



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 14, 2008

Mr. Thomas B. Scollon  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2008-04932

Dear Mr. Scollon:

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# 309019.

The City of Haltom City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the Buffalo Ridge Mineral Property. You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides in part that:

(a) 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). In this instance, Exhibit C consists of attorney fee bills. Thus, the city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(16) unless it is expressly confidential under other law. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that makes information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. We will therefore consider your argument under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for Exhibit C.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and 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 attorney fee bills contain privileged communications between or among attorneys for and representatives of the city. You state that these communications were made for the purposes of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that a portion of the attorney fee bills contain information that reveals confidential communications between privileged parties. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The remaining information at issue, however, does not consist of or reveal confidential attorney-client communications. Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue constitutes confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Therefore, none of the remaining information contained in Exhibit C may be withheld on that basis.

You assert that Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, which 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 Texas 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). 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.*, 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 explain that Exhibit B consists of privileged communications between and among attorneys for and representatives of the city. You explain that these communications were intended to be confidential and that their confidentiality has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Exhibit B may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The remaining 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jordan Johnson".

Jordan Johnson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 309019

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kevin Strawser  
Chesapeake Energy Corporation  
301 Commerce Street, Suite 600  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(w/o enclosures)