

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

16870 WEST BERNARDO DRIVE, SUITE 330
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92127-1671
(858) 485-9526

FAX (858) 485-9412
WWW.AALRR.COM

CERRITOS
(562) 653-3200

FRESNO
(559) 225-6700

IRVINE
(949) 453-4260

PASADENA
(626) 583-8600

PLEASANTON
(925) 227-9200

RIVERSIDE
(951) 683-1122

SACRAMENTO
(916) 923-1200

OUR FILE NUMBER:

005232.00060
14040836.1

May 13, 2016

VIA EMAIL (CLINT.PAULSON@GMAIL.COM)

Mr. Clint Paulson
Torrance, California

Re: Public Records Act Request re:
Case No. YC068686, *James D. McGee v. Torrance Unified School District, et al.*
Case No. YC069859, *James D. McGee, et al. v. Balfour Beatty, et al.*
Case No. YC070614, *James D. McGee, et al. v. Balfour Beatty, et al.*

Dear Mr. Paulson:

This firm represents the Torrance Unified School District ("District") and a copy of your email dated May 3, 2016, seeking documents pursuant to the Public Records Act has been forward to us for a response. Your May 3, 2016, email requests the following documents:

1. Invoices received from and/or all payments made to the law office of Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo or any other attorney's inclusive of Martin A. Hom and Jennifer Cantrell for legal costs associated with court case #'s YC068686, YC069859, YC070614 or any other case involving plaintiff Jim McGee.

The California Public Records Act grants access to public records held by state and local agencies unless the public records fall within one of the specified exemptions. (Gov. Code § 6254.) Unfortunately, legal invoices are privileged attorney-client communications and are exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act.

Section 6254 provides that nothing in this chapter shall be construed to require the disclosure of records that are,

- (k) Records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.

The Public Records Act does not require the disclosure of a document that is subject to the attorney-client privilege. (*Sanchez v. County of San Bernardino* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 516, 527.) The attorney-client privilege is set forth in Evidence Code section 950 et seq. and protects confidential communications between the client and the attorney. (*Costco Wholesale Corp. v.*

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

Mr. Clint Paulson

May 13, 2016

Page 2

Superior Court (2009) 47 Cal.4th 725, 732; *Roberts v. City of Palmdale* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 363, 371.) Evidence Code section 954 “confers a privilege on the client ‘to refuse to disclose, and to prevent another from disclosing, a confidential communication between client and lawyer. . . .’” (*Costco, supra*, 5 Cal.4th at 732.)

Recently, the Second District Court of Appeal found that attorney invoices were confidential attorney-client communications that fell under the Public Records Act exemptions and were, therefore, not subject to disclosure. (*County of Los Angeles Supervisors v. Superior Court* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 1154, rev. granted July 8, 2015.) The Court held that Evidence Code section 952 protects communications between clients and attorneys when those communications are transmitted confidentially in the course of that attorney-client relationship and legal invoices fell within those confidential attorney-client communications.

Accordingly, since the District’s legal invoices are attorney-client confidential communications, they are exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act.

Sincerely,

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Hom', with a large, stylized initial 'M' at the start.

Martin A. Hom

cc: Dr. G. Mannon
Dr. D. Stabler
T. Tao, Esq.