



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2022

Mr. Daniel Sylvia  
Counsel for the City of Dayton  
Olson & Olson LLP  
1517 Trinity Street  
Liberty, Texas 77575

OR2022-18534

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

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# 955831.

The City of Dayton (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for certain information regarding a specified investigation pertaining to a named individual, including the personnel file of the named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have submitted only an investigation report in response to the requests for information. To the extent any additional information responsive to the requests existed on the date the city received the requests, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *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).

Next, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(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 report subject to section 552.022(a)(1). This information must be released 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.* Although you assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 for the submitted information. Additionally, as section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential, we will consider the arguments under section 552.101 for the submitted information. Further, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that makes 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 for the submitted information.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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).

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). *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). 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 state the submitted information consists of an investigation that was prepared by an investigator retained by the city’s legal counsel and was communicated between the city’s legal counsel and city employees and officials. You also state the information at issue was communicated for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you state the communication at issue was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based upon your representations and our 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 purposes of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted 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,

James M. Graham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JMG/eb

Ref: ID# 955831

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)