



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 15, 2013

Ms. Julia Gannaway  
Counsel for the City of Waxahachie  
Lynn, Ross & Gannaway, L.L.P.  
306 West Broadway Avenue  
Fort Worth, Texas 76104

OR2013-12039

Dear Ms. Gannaway:

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# 493085.

The City of Waxahachie (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for eleven categories of information regarding officers of the Waxahachie Police Department, including information pertaining to the requestor's client. The city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information pertains to a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in relevant part the following:

- (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or 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). Although you assert the submitted information is excepted under sections 552.103 and 552.107(1) of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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 (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under sections 552.103 or 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held 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 consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the submitted information. In addition, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will address your argument under this section.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence 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). 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7.

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 the submitted information consists of an investigative report prepared by the city’s outside legal counsel and provided to the city to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services and advice to the city. You state the report was intended to be and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney’s entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup>

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open\\_orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open_orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cynthia G. Tynan". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C".

Cynthia G. Tynan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CGT/ag

Ref: ID# 493085

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)