



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2017

Mr. Corey S. Sainz
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2017-28373

Dear Mr. Sainz:

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# 689694 (Case No. 17-1020-1159).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to legal services provided to the city by a named entity in connection with a specified project. The city indicates it has released some information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.106, 552.107, 552.110, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The city also states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C. ("Abernathy"). Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Abernathy of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Abernathy. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, although the city raises section 552.110 of the Government Code, we note section 552.110 protects the interests of third parties that provide information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepts from disclosure trade secrets or commercial or financial information obtained from person). Thus, we do not address the city's argument under section 552.110.

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:

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

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

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (16). The submitted information includes an invoice that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) and attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16). Information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) or section 552.022(a)(16) must be released unless such information is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3), (16). The city seeks to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103, 552.106, 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary exceptions 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 section 552.103); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 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). Therefore, the information at issue, which we marked, may not be withheld under these exceptions. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, 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 address the city's attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the city's attorney work product privilege claim under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the information at issue. Additionally, because sections 552.101 and 552.136 can make information confidential under the Act, we will address their applicability to the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. We will also address the city's remaining arguments for 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).

Abernathy and the city assert the submitted attorney fee bills must be withheld in their entirety under rule 503. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides

information “that is *in* a bill for attorney’s fees” is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)), 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney’s legal advice). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the fee bills at issue under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Abernathy and the city also assert the fee bills at issue include privileged attorney-client communications between attorneys representing the city and city representatives in their capacities as clients. Abernathy and the city state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. Further, Abernathy and the city state the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on these representations and our review, we find Abernathy and the city have established some of the information at issue, which we marked, constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ However, we find the remaining information either reveals a communication with a party that has not been 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. Thus, we find Abernathy and the city have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney client communications. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld 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 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.*

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

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.

Abernathy and the city contend the remaining information subject to section 552.022 constitutes attorney work product protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find Abernathy and the city 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. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals,

not those of corporate and other business entities. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); see also *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); see *id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue consists of an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. See Gov’t Code §§ 552.136(a), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.136 of the Government Code to the information at issue, and the city may not withhold any of it on that ground.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for

information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The city states a lawsuit styled *Grossman v. City of El Paso*, Cause No. 201-DCV-2528, initiated in the 384th Judicial District Court of El Paso County, Texas, was pending against the city in the Eighth Court of Appeals prior to the city's receipt of this request for information. The city states the information at issue is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on these representations and our review of the information, we find litigation was pending when the city received this request for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.²

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the information we marked pursuant to sections 552.022(a)(3) and 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. In releasing the information subject to section 552.022(a)(16), the city may withhold the information we marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 'KH' followed by a stylized flourish.

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 689694

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

1 Third Party
(w/o enclosures)