



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 4, 2019

Ms. Barbara Boulware-Wells  
Counsel for The City of Ranger  
The Knight Law Firm  
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105  
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2019-27933

Dear Ms. Boulware-Wells:

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# 789480.

The City of Ranger (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all bills for attorney's fees during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 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 the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege" unless the information is expressly confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). You seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We note section 552.107 is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* 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). As such, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted fee bills under section 552.107(1) 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). Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information you marked. Additionally, because section 552.101 of the Government Code

makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your argument under section 552.101 against disclosure of the information at issue.

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. *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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding). We note communications with third parties with whom a governmental entity shares a privity of interest are protected. Open Records Decision Nos. 464 (1987), 429 (1985).

You assert the portions of the submitted fee bills you marked should be withheld under rule 503. You state the submitted information includes communications between attorneys for the city and city officials that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established some of the information you marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup> However, we find some of the communications at issue are with individuals you have not demonstrated are privileged parties, or do not document a communication. We note an entry stating a memorandum or e-mail was prepared, drafted, or reviewed does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the information we marked for release under rule 503.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. You assert some of the remaining information is protected by common-law privacy. Upon review, however, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'KH' followed by a stylized flourish.

Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/gw

Ref: ID# 789480

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)