



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 17, 2018

~~Ms. Melissa A. Mihalick
Counsel for the Walker County Hospital District
Bracewell L.L.P.
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002-2770~~

OR2018-12141A

Dear Ms. Mihalick:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2018-12141 (2018) on May 22, 2018. Since that date, we have received new information that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on May 22, 2018. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act ("Act")). This ruling was assigned ID# 736391.

The Walker County Hospital District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for specified information regarding the termination of a specified contract between the district and the Walker County Hospital Corporation d/b/a Huntsville Memorial Hospital ("HMH").¹ You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.105, and 552.107 of the Government Code. Further, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of HMH. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified this third party 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 id.* § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from HMH. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of 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:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (16). The information at issue contains contracts and attorney fee bills that are subject to sections 552.022(a)(3) and 552.022(a)(16). Information subject to sections 552.022(a)(3) and 552.022(a)(16) must be released unless such information is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3), (16). You seek to withhold the information subject to 552.022(a)(16) under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 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. 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 information subject to 552.022(a)(16) may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, 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). Therefore, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the submitted information subject to 552.022(a)(16). HMH claims the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. As stated above, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act; therefore, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.104(b) provides information encompassed by section 552.022 may be withheld under sections 552.104 and

552.110 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.104(b) (information protected by section 552.104 not subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022(a)). Further, section 552.110 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act for purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, we will consider HMMH's arguments under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. We will also address the submitted arguments for the information not subject to 552.022 of the Government Code.

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).

You assert 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 district may not withhold the entirety of the submitted fee bills under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

The district asserts the submitted fee bills subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code include privileged attorney-client communications between the district’s outside counsel and the district. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. You state the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. However, upon review, we find you have failed to establish any of the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the submitted fee bills subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code may not be withheld under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Section 552.104(a) excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party’s property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at 841. HMH states it has competitors. In addition, HMH states release of its information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited only to ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 831, 839. After review of the information and consideration of the arguments, we find HMH has established the release of HMH’s

information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The district states, and provides documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Covington v. Huntsville Memorial Hospital*, Cause No. 1828671, was pending against the district in the 278th District Court of Walker County, Texas, when it received the instant request for information. You state the information at issue is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the information at issue, we find litigation was pending when the district received this request for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(16) under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.³

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address HMH's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the district may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a). The district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(16) under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. 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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Emily Buchanan
Attorney
Open Records Division

EB/som

Ref: ID# 736391

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)