



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 26, 2019

Mr. Mark Kratovil
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Tarrant County
401 West Belknap
Fort Worth, Texas 76196

OR2019-08234

Dear Mr. Kratovil:

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# 756590.

The Tarrant County Criminal District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all time and expense records pertaining to specified litigation. The district attorney's office claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the district attorney's office claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, the district attorney's office argues it was not in possession of any documents responsive to the request as it had "not been billed for any services by the outside counsel." The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.-San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992),

¹We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). A governmental body is not required to create or obtain information that is not in its possession, so long as no other individual or entity holds that information on behalf of the governmental body that receives the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 534 at 2-3 (1989), 518 at 3 (1989). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 102. As the district attorney's office has submitted a representative sample of information for our review, we assume the district attorney's office has made a good-faith effort to relate the request to information it maintains.

Next, we note the submitted information consists of an attorney fee bill that is 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 expressly confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). The district attorney's office seeks to withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107(1), and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary 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 (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). As such, the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the submitted fee bill under section 552.103, section 552.107(1), or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, 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 address the district attorney's office's assertion 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 for the submitted attorney fee bill.

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). *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).

The district attorney's office asserts the submitted attorney fee bill must be withheld in its 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 Decisions 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 district attorney's office may not withhold the entirety of the submitted fee bill under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

The district attorney's office also asserts portions of the submitted fee bill should be withheld under rule 503. The district attorney's office asserts the submitted fee bill includes

privileged attorney-client communications between outside counsel, the district attorney's office, and Tarrant County (the "county") that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. The district attorney's office states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the district attorney's office has established the information we have marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the district attorney's office may withhold the information we have marked within the submitted attorney fee bill pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.² However, we find the district attorney's office has failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under rule 503.

We next address Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information. 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 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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district attorney's office's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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, no writ).


The district attorney's office claims the remaining information 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 the district attorney's office has not demonstrated the remaining information contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or the attorney's representative that was developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial. We therefore conclude the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary, the district attorney's office may withhold the information we have marked within the submitted attorney fee bill pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district attorney's office 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,



Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/mo

Ref: ID# 756590

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)