



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 9, 2019

Ms. Victoria Hayslett  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
P.O. Box 1890  
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2019-28385

Dear Ms. Hayslett:

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# 790167 (Ref. No. 19-1020-1242).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for invoices pertaining to specified legal services and documents authorizing the retention of a specified law firm for a stated purpose. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 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 you have not submitted information responsive to the portion of the request seeking documents authorizing the retention of a specified law firm. Additionally, you do not inform us the city has released this information. Although you state the city has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the types of information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the types of information the city has submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of Gov't Code § 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Accordingly, to the extent any information responsive to this portion of the request existed on the date the city received the present request, we assume the city has released it to the requestor. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which 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 is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). We note the submitted information includes attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16). Information subject to section 552.022(a)(16) must be released unless such information is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under sections 552.101, 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 (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 may not be withheld under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 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). Thus, we will consider your arguments 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. In addition, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your argument under this section for the information at issue.

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

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). 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).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022(a)(16) should be withheld as privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. You state the submitted fee bills include privileged attorney-client communications between privileged parties and outside legal counsel that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have established the information we marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>1</sup> However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of attorney-client communications that were communicated only to privileged parties. 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, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client communications.

---

<sup>1</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under rule 503.

Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You assert section 552.107 for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the city and city employees and officials that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications at issue were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

We next address your argument under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. 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). Thus, 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

---

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

“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, no writ).

You claim the remaining information subject to section 552.022 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 at issue 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. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the information at issue, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. 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 you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(16) 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Blake Brennan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BBX/mo

Ref: ID# 790167

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)