



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2014

Ms. Katie Payne
Counsel for Port Aransas Independent School District
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2014-13675

Dear Ms. Payne:

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# 532019.

The Port Aransas Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of the summary and conclusions of a specified investigation, a copy of specified grievance settlement agreement, and copies of district e-mail communications between staff members over a specified time period.¹ You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106 and 552.107 of the Government Code, as well as

¹You state the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S. W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.² We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted any of the requested e-mails for our review. You provide documentation showing the district requested the scope of the request in regard to the e-mails be narrowed. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if large amount of information is requested, governmental body may discuss with requestor how scope of request may be narrowed); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so request may be properly narrowed). You do not indicate the district has received a response to its request for narrowing the portion of the request at issue. Thus, for the portion of the requested information for which you have not received clarification, we find the district is not required to release information in response to that portion of the request. However, if the requestor clarifies or narrows that portion of the request for information, the district must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Next, we note the submitted information consists of a completed¹ investigation report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code, which reads as follows:

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). You assert this information is excepted from release under sections 552.106 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002).

section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.106 or 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your arguments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides the following:

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).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must do the following: (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the

privilege or the communication 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, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the submitted information consists of an investigative report prepared by legal counsel for the district and provided to the district to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services and advice to the district. 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 district may withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.³

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

Sincerely,



Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 532019

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)