



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 25, 2015

Mr. Ramit Plushnick-Masti
Public Information Officer
Houston Forensic Science Center
1200 Travis Street, 20th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2015-20094

Dear Mr. Plushnick-Masti:

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# 580720.

The Houston Forensic Science Center (the "center") received a request for the personnel file, employment file, and records of a named employee of the center. The center claims the submitted information is privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹ We have considered the exception the center claims and reviewed the submitted information.²

Initially, we note the center has only submitted a draft report. We assume, to the extent any information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the center received the request, the center has released it. If the center has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records

¹Although the center raises section 552.022 of the Government Code, section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022.

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he 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). The submitted information is part of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The center must release the submitted information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* We note the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the center's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

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

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).

The center states the submitted information consists of a draft report of a completed investigation conducted by the City of Houston’s Office of the Inspector General (the “OIG”) pursuant to Executive Order 1-39. The center informs us the OIG is a division of the Office of the City Attorney. Thus, the center states the submitted information consists of a communication involving the OIG and the center in its capacity as a client. The center states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the center and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the center has established the information at issue constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the center may withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Wheelus', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 580720

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)