



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 5, 2019

Ms. Jelain Chubb
State Archivist and Director
Texas State Library and Archives Commission
P.O. Box 12927
Austin, Texas 78711-2927

OR2019-34289

Dear Ms. Chubb:

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# 800024.

The Texas State Library and Archives Commission (the "commission") received a request for all records pertaining to a named individual and a specified topic from a specified time period.¹ You state the commission has released some information. Although the commission takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state the release of the submitted information may implicate the interests of the Office of the Attorney General ("OAG"). Accordingly, you state you notified the OAG of the request for information and of its right to submit comments to this office as to why its information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the OAG. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹ The commission 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.2d 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).

² 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.

We note, and the OAG acknowledges, the submitted information consists of completed investigations that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body” unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or “other law.” *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). 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 OAG’s claims of the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the submitted information.

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 and 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. *See Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002)*. 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). *See 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 attached to complete communication, including factual information).

The OAG states some of the information at issue consists of communications between and among OAG attorneys and staff. The OAG asserts the communications were made for the purpose of providing professional legal services. The OAG further states these communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based upon the OAG's representations and our review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of communications protected by the attorney-client privilege. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney's entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege when attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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 anticipated 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).

The OAG claims the remaining information consists of attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The OAG states the information at issue consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of OAG attorneys. The OAG states the information at issue was created in preparation for litigation. Upon review, we find the OAG has demonstrated the information at issue constitutes core attorney work product. Therefore, we conclude the commission may withhold the remaining information, which we marked, under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The commission may withhold the remaining information, which we marked, under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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,



Kimbell Kesling
Attorney
Open Records Division

KK/gw

Ref: ID# 800024

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Party
(w/o enclosures)