



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 12, 2017

Mr. Ronald D. Stutes
Counsel for the City of Palestine
Potter Minton, P.C.
110 North College Avenue, Suite 500
Tyler, Texas 75702

OR2017-20892

Dear Mr. Stutes:

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# 674893.

The City of Palestine (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to expenses the city has spent towards a specified lawsuit during a specific date range. The city states it has released some information. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 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 consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) 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). You seek to withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 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. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (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 at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, 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). Therefore, 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 submitted information.

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 fee bills consist of communications involving attorneys for the city, city employees, and city 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 city. You also state the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has established the information we have marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under rule 503.

We next address Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information at issue. 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* 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.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

You claim the remaining information you marked consists of attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, however, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or the attorney's representative that were developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. 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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSR/tdw

Ref: ID# 674893

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)