



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 5, 2015

Ms. Erin Higginbotham
Counsel for the City of Westlake Hills
Bojorquez Law Firm, P.C.
12325 Hymeadow Drive, Suite 2-100
Austin, Texas 78750

OR2015-23233

Dear Ms. Higginbotham:

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# 586027.

The City of Westlake Hills (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for ten categories of information related to agreements or contracts between the city and several named individuals or law firms, lists of the city's special commissioners and any appraisal firms used or retained by the city during a specified time period, and all documents signed by a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, as well as privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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 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.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a resolution passed by the City Council. As laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records), 221 at 1 (1979) (official records of governmental body's public proceedings are among most open of records). The submitted resolution is analogous to an ordinance. Therefore, the submitted resolution, which we have marked, must be released.

Next, we note some of the remaining 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:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (17). The remaining information includes a contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) and court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3), (17). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. You further seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are discretionary in nature 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld 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" 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 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. We will also consider your argument under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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 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 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 assert the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) is protected by the attorney-client privilege of rule 503. You assert the information was communicated between attorneys for the city and city officials and staff in their capacities as clients. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. You state the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has established the information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for some of the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

As noted above, you inform us some of the remaining information, which you have marked, consists of communications between attorneys for the city and city officials and staff in their capacities as clients, made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.107 of the Government Code.³

In summary, the city must release the marked resolution. The city may withhold the information we marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the information we marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, which we marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code.

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.

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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 that reads "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the "S" at the end.

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 586027

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)