



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 14, 2022

Mr. Nico Arias  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-20370

Dear Mr. Arias:

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# 956317 (PIR No. R003419-032922).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to legal services provided to the city for a specified timeframe. You state the city has released some information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Carter Arnett, PLLC and Lloyd, Gosselink, Rochelle & Townsend, P.C. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from either third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110

(requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties may have in the information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 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 confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(16). The submitted information includes attorney fee bills subject to section 552.022(a)(16). The city must release this information unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city raises section 552.107 of the Government Code for this information, this section is a discretionary exception 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). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(16), which we have indicated, under section 552.107. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, 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 attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information at issue. Further, we will address the city’s argument under section 552.107 against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(16).

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 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).

When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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. *Id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication 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 asserts the submitted attorney fee bills must be withheld in their entirety under rule 503. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides information “that is *in* a bill for attorney’s fees” is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)), 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney’s legal advice). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the submitted fee bills under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

The city states the information at issue contain communications between outside counsel for the city, city attorneys and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Upon review, we find the city has established some of the information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information, which we have indicated, under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information within the attorney fee bills 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 may not withhold any of the remaining information within the attorney fee bills under rule 503. Accordingly, the city must release the remaining information in the attorney fee bills pursuant to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. When asserting the attorney client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary

facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. ORD 676 at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The city states the remaining information consists of communications between outside counsel for the city, city attorneys, and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. The city states the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of privileged attorney client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(16) under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we indicated in the attorney fee bills under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must release the remaining information in the attorney fee bills pursuant to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(16) under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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,

Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/eb

Ref: ID# 956317

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)