



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 8, 2022

Mr. Zachariah T. Evans
Counsel for the Williamson-Travis Counties Municipal Utility District No. 1
McGinnis & Lochridge
111 West 6th Street, Building B, Suite 400
Austin, Texas 78703

OR2022-34872

Dear Mr. Evans:

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# 979630.

The Williamson-Travis Counties Municipal Utility District No. 1 (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to specified litigation. You state some information has been released. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. You also state you notified Richards Rodriguez & Skeith and Anderson Mill West Neighborhood Association of the request for information and of its 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 your arguments 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) of the Government Code 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 any notified third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any notified third party has 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 district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any notified third party may have in the information.

Next, we note, a portion of the submitted information consists of 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 confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(16). 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 your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information at issue.

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).

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. 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). *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 extends to entire communication, including factual information).

The district explains the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. 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 district has established the information we have marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the district may withhold the information we marked within the remaining information pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue 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. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the district 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,

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/pt

Ref: ID# 979630

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)