



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 9, 2020

Ms. Christine Badillo
Counsel for the Lake Travis Independent School District
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Russo & Kyle, P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2020-00941

Dear Ms. Badillo:

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# 805431.

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for four categories of information pertaining to an investigation of a named individual. You state the district released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We also received comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, the district acknowledges, and we agree, the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

¹ We 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.

(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 a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The district seeks to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.107 and 552.111 are discretionary in nature and do 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). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under sections 552.107 or 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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 address the district's claims of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 192.5 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 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).

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).

The district states the submitted information was communicated between the district’s attorney and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. The district states the information was created in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. The district states the information was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has 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 district may withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.²


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->

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 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,



Katie Stallcup
Attorney
Open Records Division

AKS/eb

Ref: ID# 805431

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)