



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 10, 2020

Mr. Lawrence C. Collister
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Denton
215 East McKinney Street
Denton, Texas 76201

OR2020-30981

Dear Mr. Collister:

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# 857418 (Ref. No. C001035-090220).

The City of Denton (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to specified policies and a specified lawsuit.¹ The city states it released some information to the requestor. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.² We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains 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). The city seeks to withhold the information at issue under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, section 552.107(1) is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client

¹ The city states it 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).

² Although the city failed to timely raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, because this section can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted fee bills under section 552.107(1). 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 address the city’s claim of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the submitted attorney fee bills. We will also consider the city’s argument under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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 the submitted fee bills include privileged attorney-client communications between attorneys for the city and city officials and staff in their capacities as clients. The city explains the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. The city states the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has established the information we marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the privileged attorney-client communications, a representative sample of which we marked, within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.³

However, we find the city failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of privileged attorney client communications. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an e-mail was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Therefore, the city has not demonstrated the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 154.073 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Except as provided by Subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), a communication relating to the subject matter of any civil or criminal dispute made by a participant in an alternative dispute resolution procedure, whether before or after the institution of formal judicial proceedings, is confidential, is not subject to disclosure, and may not be used as evidence against the participant in any judicial or administrative proceeding.

(b) Any record made at an alternative dispute resolution procedure is confidential, and the participants or the third party facilitating the procedure may not be required to testify in any proceedings related to or arising out of the matter in dispute or be subject to process requiring disclosure of confidential information or data relating to or arising out of the matter in dispute.

Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 154.073(a), (b). In Open Records Decision No. 658 (1998), this office found communications during the formal settlement process were intended to be confidential. *See* ORD 658 at 4. Upon review, we find the city failed to establish the remaining information at issue consists of communications made during an alternative dispute resolution procedure. Therefore, the information at issue is not confidential under section 154.073, and the city may not withhold the remaining information under section

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 154.073 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold all routing and bank account numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the privileged attorney-client communications, a representative sample of which we marked, within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city must withhold all routing and bank account numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 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/gw

Ref: ID# 857418

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).