



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 28, 2022

Mr. Matthew Poston
County Attorney
Liberty County
1923 Sam Houston Street, Suite 202
Liberty, Texas 77575

OR2022-22166

Dear Mr. Poston:

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# 961964.

Liberty County (the "county") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified investigation.¹ We understand the county released some of the requested information, but made redactions as permitted by section 552.024 of the Government Code.² The county claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ The county states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c)(1)-(2).

Initially, we note section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code states a governmental body asking for an attorney general decision must, within fifteen business days of receiving a request, provide the attorney general with “a copy of the specific information requested, *or submit representative samples of information if a voluminous amount of information was requested.*” Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (emphasis added). The county has submitted a voluminous amount of information rather than a representative sample. We have identified and reviewed a representative sample of the voluminous information submitted.³

Next, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 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:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The county must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The county seeks to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 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 section 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 section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 564 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.105 subject to waiver), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the county may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider the county’s argument under section 552.108 for the information at issue. Further, we note 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 county’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.

³ To the extent the county identifies confidential information subject to a provision not addressed in this ruling, the county should contact the Open Government Hotline.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

(1) material 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.* 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude 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.

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, the governmental body may assert the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the attorney work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes (citing *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993))); *see also* *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 380 (Tex. 1994) (holding "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case").

The county claims the submitted information consists of the county's entire litigation file that was created in anticipation of litigation pertaining to the investigation specified in the request. The county further states the information at issue consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of attorneys or attorneys'

representatives. Based upon these representations and our review, we conclude the county has established the information at issue constitutes attorney work product. Accordingly, the county may withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.⁴

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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACB/jxd

Ref: ID# 961964

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.