



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 10, 2016

Ms. Marie N. Rovira
Counsel for The City of Lavon
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, PLLC
6351 Preston Road, Suite 350
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2016-05584

Dear Ms. Rovira:

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# 601978.

The City of Lavon (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for specified invoices and information pertaining to payments made to a named company.¹ The city states it has released some of the requested information, but claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code, which provides the following:

¹The city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (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) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

²Although the city also raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990) (predecessor statute).

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:

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Although the city asserts this information is excepted from release under section 552.107 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (section 552.107 is not other law for purposes of section 552.022); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.107. However, 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). Consequently, we will consider the assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 for this information.

Rule 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 city asserts the information it has marked consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. It also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the city has established some of the information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney client communications. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an email was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Consequently, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue was communicated and it does not reveal a client confidence. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 503. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503, but 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 601978

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)