



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 24, 2020

Mr. Joseph G Hays
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2020-21188

Dear Mr. Crawford:

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# 841476 (GC No. 26714).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You state the city released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered the submitted argument and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and the city acknowledges, the submitted information consists of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body" unless the information is expressly confidential under the Act or other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). 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 address the city's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence 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).

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).

The city states pursuant to City of Houston Executive Order 1-39 (Revised), the city's Office of the Inspector General (the "OIG") is a division of the Office of the City Attorney and acts under that office's supervision. The city informs us the submitted information consists of communications between employees of the OIG in their capacities as attorneys and attorney representatives and employees of the city in their capacities as clients and client representatives. The city explains the information was created in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states the information at issue was not intended for release to third parties, and the city states it has maintained the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has 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 city 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 <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 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
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AKS/mo

Ref: ID# 841476

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)