



April 2, 2001

Ms. Amanda Crawford
Assistant Attorney General
Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2001-1282

Dear Ms. Crawford:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 145529.

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a written request for the following information:

- 1) Copies of any and all complaints filed with the [OAG] against Turn of the Century Adventure (based in Irving).
- 2) Records of any and all actions taken by the [OAG] against Turn of the Century Adventure.
- 3) Records of any and all correspondence between the [OAG] and Turn of the Century Adventure.
- 4) Copies of any and all complaints filed with the [OAG] against Travelbridge of North Texas.
- 5) Records of any and all actions taken by the [OAG] against Travelbridge of North Texas.

- 6) Records of any and all correspondence between the [OAG] and Travelbridge of North Texas.

You state that “[o]ver 500 pages of information which the OAG contends are not excepted from disclosure are being released to the requestor.” Additionally, you state that the OAG does not possess any information responsive to item 4.¹ You seek to withhold, however, two documents as “attorney work product” pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency” and encompasses attorney work product. Open Records Decision No. 647 (1996). The first requirement that must be met to consider information “attorney work product” is that the information must have been created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. In order for this office to conclude that information was created 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 conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

See National 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. After reviewing the totality of the circumstances surrounding the department’s investigation, we believe that both of these tests have been met in this instance.

The second requirement that must be met is that the work product “consists of or tends to reveal the thought processes of an attorney in the civil litigation process.” Open Records Decision No. 647 at 4 (1996). Although the attorney work product privilege protects information that reveals the mental processes, conclusions, and legal theories of the attorney, it generally does not extend to a neutral recital of facts obtained by the attorney. *Id.* However, upon review of your arguments and the memoranda at issue, we agree that the information at issue would tend to reveal the attorney’s mental impressions and legal theories regarding the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we conclude that the OAG may withhold

¹The Public Information Act does not require a governmental body to obtain information not in its possession or to prepare new information in response to a requestor. Open Records Decision No. 445 (1986).

these two records as attorney work product pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

²Because we resolve your request under section 552.111, we need not address your other claimed exceptions.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jennifer Bialek". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Jennifer Bialek
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JHB/RWP/seg

Ref: ID# 145529

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Mark Smith
Investigative Producer
WFAA-TV
606 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)