



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 15, 2015

Ms. Theresa Pham
Counsel for the City of West Lake Hills
Bojorquez Law Firm, P.C.
12325 Hymeadow Drive, Suite 2-100
Austin, Texas 78750

OR2015-07296

Dear Ms. Pham:

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# 559990.

The City of West Lake Hills (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for attorney fee bills from a named attorney and a specified law firm for a specified time period. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

We note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for 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 confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Although you seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and do not

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

²We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the submitted information.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client’s representative and the client’s lawyer or the lawyer’s representative;

(B) between the client’s lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;

(C) by the client, the client’s representative, the client’s lawyer, or the lawyer’s representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer’s representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client’s representatives or between the client and the client’s representative; 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 to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, 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. *See*

Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). 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 information you have marked in the submitted attorney fee-bills consists of communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You explain the communications were exchanged between employees of the city, attorneys for the city, and the city's outside counsel. You state the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established some of the information you seek to withhold, which we have marked, constitutes privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, the remaining information at issue either is not a communication or reveals a communication with a party whom the city has not established as privileged with respect to the communication. Thus, you have not established any of the remaining information you have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis. As the city raises no other exceptions to disclosure, it must release the remaining information.

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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 559990

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)