



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 23, 2020

Mr. Robert Schell
Assistant Ellis County & District Attorney
Ellis County
109 South Jackson
Waxahachie, Texas 75165

OR2020-08904

Dear Mr. Schell:

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# 817871.

The Ellis County & District Attorney's Office (the "attorney's office") received a request for ten categories of information pertaining to a named individual. You state district attorney's office does not possess some of the requested information.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of records of a grand jury. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *Id.* § 552.003(1)(B); *see also id.* § 552.0035 (access to judicial records is governed by rules adopted by Supreme Court of Texas or other applicable laws or rules). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

(1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the district attorney's office holds the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of a record of the judiciary that is not subject to disclosure under the Act and the district attorney's office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the district attorney's office does not hold the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury, we will address the arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request because it does not pertain to any of the information requested by the requestor. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which you marked, and the district attorney's office need not release it in response to this request.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." *See* Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) [M]aterial prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

- a) 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 b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. 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; ORD 677 at 7.

You claim the attorney work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code for the information you marked. You state the information you marked was made “in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation.” The district attorney’s office states the information at issue consists of materials created by and revealing the strategy decisions and mental processes of attorneys for the district attorney’s office. Thus, you contend the information you marked was made in anticipation of litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the district attorney’s office may withhold the information you marked under the work product privilege encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code.² 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 <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,

Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/be

Ref: ID# 817871

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

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