



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 22, 2017

Mr. Joey Moore
Counsel for the Abilene Independent School District
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Russo & Kyle, P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2017-13888

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 662878.

The Abilene Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all billing statements and invoices pertaining to education matters during a certain time period.¹ You state the district will release some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code, as well as privileged pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹You state, and provide documentation showing, the district sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *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 overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills. Section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code 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. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16). Although you assert section 552.107 for the information at issue, this is a discretionary exception that does not make information confidential for purposes of the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1)), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.107 of the Government Code. You also seek to withhold the information at issue under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the 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 your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information at issue.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 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. *See id.* 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 portions of the submitted fee bills reflect privileged attorney-client communications between the district's attorneys and attorney representatives, and district officials in their capacities as clients. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. You inform us the communications at issue were not disclosed to third parties, and confidentiality has not been waived. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have established some of the information at issue constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.³ However, the remaining information at issue either consists of a communication with a party who is not identified as privileged or is not a communication. 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. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged communications for purposes of rule 503, and the district may not withhold it under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

We next address your argument under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Rule 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* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). 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

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

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.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You claim the remaining information at issue consists of attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of trial. Thus, the district may not withhold the information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C".

Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/sb

Ref: ID# 662878

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)