



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2022

Ms. Rebekah Wendt
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2022-30929

Dear Ms. Wendt:

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# 977137 (Ref. No. R075538).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for all information related to a specified complaint investigated by the city's Office of Inspector General (the "OIG"). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note most of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 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). You acknowledge the submitted information pertains of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city 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 expressly made confidential

under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the completed investigation, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* 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, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may not be withheld under section 552.107. You raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Further, we will consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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).

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).

You state, pursuant to City of Houston Executive Order 1-39 (Revised), the OIG is a division of the city's Office of the City Attorney and acts under that office's supervision. You inform us the information at issue was communicated between OIG employees in their capacities as attorney representatives and city employees in their capacities as clients and client representatives. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has established most of the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. *Cf. Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney's entire investigative report 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). Thus, the city may withhold most of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information we marked consists of privileged attorney client communications. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information we marked under rule 503.

Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) constitutes communications between city attorneys and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we conclude you have failed to establish the remaining information at issue constitutes privileged communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1), and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

In summary, except for the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the submitted information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

The city may withhold the information we marked under sections 552.107(1). The city must release the remaining information.¹

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,

Cesar Mata
Attorney
Open Records Division

CM/pt

Ref: ID# 977137

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.