



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 12, 2022

Ms. Bridgette Begle
Counsel for the City of Humble
Olson & Olson, L.L.P.
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2022-31369

Dear Ms. Begle:

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# 978100 (Ref. No. Freeport22-006).

The City of Freeport (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) 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 investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and must be released unless the information is either excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The city seeks to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary in nature 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider the city's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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 information was communicated between attorneys for the city and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city also states the information was communicated in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city explains the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney's entire investigation 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). Accordingly, the city may withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹

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,

Chase D. Young
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDY/pt

Ref: ID# 978100

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.