



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 24, 2009

Mr. George E. Hyde
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2009-08668

Dear Mr. Hyde:

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# 346935.

The City of Windcrest (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the city's special legal fees. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

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:

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

¹We note that in your brief dated April 28, 2009, you have withdrawn your remaining assertions under the Act.

(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)(3), (16). In this instance, the submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the expenditure of public funds as well as attorney fee bills. Thus, the city must release these documents unless they are expressly confidential under other law. You raise sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code for this information. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are discretionary exceptions under the Act and do not constitute "other law" for 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.107.

The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. See *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will determine whether the city may withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. You also claim an exception under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is a confidentiality provision for the purposes of section 552.022. Thus, we will consider your argument under section 552.101 against disclosure of the information subject to section 552.022, as well as the remaining information.

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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You state the submitted information documents communications between the city's attorneys and their clients that were made for the purpose of consultation and legal advice. You indicate that the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. We note, however, that you have failed to identify the parties to the communications in the submitted attorney fee bills. *See* ORD 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); *see generally* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (stating that predecessor to the Act places burden on governmental body to establish why and how exception applies to requested information); *Strong v. State*, 773 S.W.2d 543, 552 (Tex. Crim. App. 1989) (burden of establishing attorney-client privilege is on party asserting it). However, upon review, we have been able to discern from the face of the documents that certain individuals are privileged parties. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the remaining information in the attorney fee bills documents confidential communications that were made between privileged parties. Therefore, we conclude that Texas Rule of Evidence 503 is not applicable to the remaining information within the attorney fee bills and none of this information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision[,]" and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Gov't Code § 552.101. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy, but there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities). You claim the submitted information constitutes private financial matters between an economic development company and a governmental entity. We note there is a legitimate public interest in this information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

We will now address your claims for the remaining responsive information not subject to section 552.022. 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). 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.* 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 claim the remaining information consists of communications made for the purpose of consultation and legal advice. As previously discussed, although you have failed to identify the parties to the communications, we have been able to discern from the face of the documents that certain individuals are privileged parties. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked in the remaining documents under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to establish that the communication with opposing counsel constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

Gov't Code § 552.103. Section 552.103(a) is applicable upon a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). However, section 552.103(a) was intended to prevent the use of the Act as a method of avoiding the rules of discovery in litigation. Attorney General Opinion JM-1048 at 4 (1989). The litigation exception enables a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by requiring information related to the litigation to be obtained through discovery. Open Records Decision No. 551 at 3 (1990). Thus, no section 552.103(a) interest exists when the information was obtained from or provided to all opposing parties in the litigation. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Because the city obtained the communication you seek to withhold under section 552.103 from opposing counsel, the city may not withhold this communication under section 552.103.

You also raise section 552.137 of the Government Code for a portion of the remaining information. Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential, providing the following:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under section 552.137. Upon review, we find that the e-mail address you have highlighted in green was provided to the city on a letterhead and a coversheet and is therefore, subject to section 552.137(c)(4). Consequently, this e-mail address may not be withheld under section 552.137.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/eeg

Ref: ID# 346935

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)