



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 17, 2018

Ms. Ruhee G. Leonard
Assistant County Attorney
Williamson County
405 M.L.K. Street #7
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2018-00969

Dear Ms. Leonard:

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# 692009 (PIA-2017-271).

Williamson County (the "county") received a request for information pertaining to specified topics, including meeting minutes, phone logs, and communications among named county officials and employees, during a specified time period.¹ We understand the county has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 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, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the portions of the request seeking meeting minutes, phone logs, or postal mail. To the extent any such information existed on the date the county received the request, we assume the county has released it. If the county has not released any such information, it must do so at this time.

¹You state the county sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

You inform us the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in part:

(a) 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:

(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). You state the submitted information consists of portions of completed reports, evaluations, or investigations conducted by the county regarding the acquisition of certain property. Thus, we agree the submitted information is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the information, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, the county may not withhold the information under 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. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence 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* ORD 676. 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 submitted information consists of communications among attorneys for the county, county officials, and county employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county. You further state the communications were intended to be confidential and confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. *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 county may withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 692009

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)