



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 30, 2019

Ms. Brandy Wingate Voss
Counsel for City of Rio Grande City
Law Office of Brandy Wingate Voss PLLC
820 East Hackberry Avenue
McAllen, Texas 78501

OR2019-11438

Dear Ms. Voss:

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# 761136.

The City of Rio Grande (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for contracts and related invoices for legal services pertaining to specified litigation.¹ The city states it produced some of the requested information to the requestor, but claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state a portion of the requested information was the subject of previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2016-15596 (2016), 2017-03307 (2017), and 2017-24628 (2017). There is no indication the law,

¹The city sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

²Although the city also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 (2002).

facts, and circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, for the requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2016-15596, 2017-03307, and 2017-24628 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information was not subject to these prior rulings, we will address your arguments

Next, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides the following:

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:

...

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

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 6 (2002) (section 552.107 is not other law for purposes of section 552.022), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider the assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 and the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5.

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).

The city asserts the information it has highlighted consists of or documents confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city, or with parties who were privileged with respect to the communications at issue that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The city also asserts these communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. We note some of the information at issue consists of communications with individuals whom the city has not identified or otherwise established is a privileged party. Further, we note an entry stating a memorandum or an email was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was

communicated to the client. Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate some of the information at issue was communicated and it does not reveal a client confidence. Upon review, we determine the city has not established the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information it seeks to withhold. Therefore, the city may not withhold this information, which we have marked for release, under rule 503. Nevertheless, we agree the city may withhold the remaining information it has highlighted under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. ORD 677 at 9-10. Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. 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 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 that (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. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential 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). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding). Upon review, we find the city has not established any of the remaining information consists of privileged core attorney work product. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under rule 192.5.

Some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers in the remaining under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, for the requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2016-15596, 2017-03307, and 2017-24628 as previous determinations and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with those rulings. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information it has highlighted under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers in the remaining under section 552.136 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, 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/mo

Ref: ID# 761136

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)