



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 21, 2017

Ms. Shannon C. Francis
Assistant County Attorney
Williamson County
405 Martin Luther King Street, Box #7
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2017-18974

Dear Ms. Francis:

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# 672472.

The Williamson County Attorney's Office (the "county attorney's office") received a request for information pertaining a named former employee. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in 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). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The county attorney's office must release the submitted information pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. The Texas Supreme Court has held "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 192.5 and your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Additionally, because section 552.101 can make information confidential under the Act, we will address its applicability to the information subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of common-law privacy to information relating to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* The *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982)*. We note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

Upon review, we find the submitted information does not pertain to a sexual harassment investigation in the employment context so as to fall under the holding in *Ellen*. Therefore,

none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information may be withheld 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 when the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *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 that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the documents at issue contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test may be withheld under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

The county attorney's office contends portions of the remaining information constitute attorney work product protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining 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. *See Nat'l Tank*, 851 S.W.2d at 206 (information created in ordinary course of business constitutes work product if agency demonstrates primary motivating purpose for preparation of information was in anticipation of litigation); *see also* ORD 677 at 7. Therefore, the county attorney's office may not withhold any of the information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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 not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit 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 (2002). Accordingly, 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 that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that 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 entire communication is confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication 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 attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert the information you marked under rule 503 consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of county attorney's office that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and the communications' confidentiality has been maintained. We find you have established the information you marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that the county attorney's office may withhold under rule 503. The county attorney's office must release the remaining submitted 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,



Patrick P. Mehaffy
Attorney
Open Records Division

PPM/eb

Ref: ID# 672472

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)