



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 29, 2015

Mr. Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2015-20403

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 581417 (GC Nos. 22522 and 22531).

The City of Houston (the "city") received two requests for case number 2015-025, to include complaint numbers 111-1400215-001, 111-1400220-001, and 111-1400225-001. You claim the submitted responsive information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.117 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us some of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request because it does not pertain to complaint numbers 111-1400215-001, 111-1400220-001, and 111-1400225-001. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

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

(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 consists of completed investigations subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.*

Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code, this is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See 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).* Thus, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, you also seek to withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. 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). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Further, sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act. Accordingly, we will consider those arguments for the submitted information.

Texas Rule of Evidence 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 it is 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 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. 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, orig. proceeding).

You state pursuant to City of Houston Executive Order 1-39 (Revised), the OIG is a division of the Office of the City Attorney and acts under that office’s supervision. You inform us the submitted information was communicated between employees of the OIG in their capacities as attorneys and attorney representatives and employees of the city in their capacities as clients and client representatives. You explain the information was created in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state the information at issue was not intended for release to third parties, and you state the city has maintained the confidentiality of the information at issue. 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). Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹

¹As we make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 581417

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)