



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 12, 2017

Ms. Dawn Bracket  
Counsel for City of Van Alstyne  
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, PLLC  
6371 Preston Road, Suite 350  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2017-23303

Dear Ms. Bracket:

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# 679618.

The City of Van Alstyne (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for personnel file information pertaining to three named employees, correspondences pertaining to complaints, fee bills from a specified law firm, and meeting minutes pertaining to two specified entities from a specified time period. You state you released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under 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.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b).

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

The city received the original request for information on July 2, 2017. You also inform us the city sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the city received the required deposit on July 24, 2017. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit). You do not inform us the city was closed for any business days between July 24, 2017, and August 7, 2017. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was August 7, 2017. Although you timely raised sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code and Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, you did not raise section 552.103 of the Government Code until after the ten-business-day deadline passed. Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 with respect to its claim under section 552.103.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). By failing to timely raise section 552.103 of the Government Code, we find the city has failed to establish a compelling reason to address its claim under this section. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will consider the city's timely raised arguments for the submitted information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege; [and]

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16), (17). Exhibit 3 consists of an attorney fee bill that is subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(16). Exhibit 4

contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(16), (17). You seek to withhold some of the information subject to section 552.022 under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.107 and 552.111 are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (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), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver).* Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld under 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). We will therefore consider your assertions of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We will also consider your arguments against disclosure the information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that 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* ORD 676. 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 subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of or contractors for the district that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. We find you have established some of the information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that the city may withhold under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>2</sup> However, we note the court-filed documents have been seen by non-privileged parties. We also note an entry stating a memorandum or an email was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney client communications. Therefore, the city may not withhold this information under rule 503.

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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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).

Although you assert the attorney work product privilege for the court-filed documents, we note this information was disclosed to non-privileged parties. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney work product privilege to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) on the basis of the work product privilege in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

You raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You assert the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code consists of communications between or among the city's attorneys and city employees, and outside counsel for the city. You argue the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city and were not intended to be disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city

may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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](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,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MHT/tdw

Ref: ID# 679618

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.