



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 6, 2016

Mr. Jeffery W. Giles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2016-15267

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 617267 (GC# 23339).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for information related to complaints regarding deed restriction violations at the requestor's address, including the identity of a complainant for a specified violation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 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 in Exhibit 3 falls within the scope of section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the 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). In this instance, Exhibit 3 consists of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. A completed investigation must be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you seek to withhold Exhibit 3 under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of Government Code, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of Exhibit 3 under section 552.107 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note the attorney-client privilege encompassed by section 552.107 is also found in Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the work product privilege encompassed by section 552.111 is also found in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules 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). Accordingly, we will consider the applicability of rules 503 and 192.5 to Exhibit 3 as well as your arguments for the remaining information.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document

containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, the governmental body may assert the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the core work product aspect of the privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes (citing *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993))); *see also* *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 380 (Tex. 1994) ("the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case").

You contend the request for information encompasses the entire litigation file of a city attorney and inform us Exhibit 3 was compiled by the city attorney in preparation for trial or in anticipation of litigation. You further state Exhibit 3 reflects the thought processes, mental impressions, and legal reasoning of the attorney. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue constitutes core attorney work product. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit 3 under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See, e.g., Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S. W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not report the

¹As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state the submitted information in Exhibits 2 and 4 pertains to complaints of possible violations of sections 10-551 and 10-552 of the city's code of ordinances which carry civil penalties. You state there is no indication the subject of the complaints knows the identities of the complainants. Upon review, we conclude the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city's animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer's privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). However, we find the remaining information at issue does not identify the complainants at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit 3 under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The city may withhold the information we marked in Exhibit 2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. The city 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/dls

Ref: ID# 617267

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)