



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

January 10, 2003

Mr. Brad Norton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1546
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR2003-0222

Dear Mr. Norton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 174832.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for any information relating to Merlin "Spanky" Handley, a STAR Flight pilot. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 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 that some of the submitted information is made expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under 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;

....

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body;

....

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3), and (14). Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect a governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the documents we have marked under section 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the attorney-client privilege and work product privilege are also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, respectively. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). This office has determined that when the attorney-client privilege or work-product privilege is claimed for information that is subject to release under section 552.022, the proper analysis is whether the information at issue is excepted under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 (attorney-client communications) or Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 (work product). Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 5-6 (2002), 677 at 8-9 (2002). We will therefore consider whether the submitted information is excepted under these rules.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

A communication is “confidential” if 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. Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the document containing privileged information is 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). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Here, you have failed to demonstrate that the documents that we have marked consist of communications between privileged parties or reveal confidential communications. Thus, the marked documents may not be withheld under Rule 503.

You further claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure because it is attorney work product. An attorney’s core work product is confidential under Rule 192.5. Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney’s or the attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. 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 that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney’s or the attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *Id.* The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) 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 2) 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. The second prong of the work product test

requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Here, you have failed to show that the information at issue was created for trial or in anticipation of litigation or that it consists of the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories.

We note that you have argued that the request encompasses the attorney's entire litigation file. Open Records Decision No. 647 noted that a request encompassing an attorney's entire litigation file could implicate the work product privilege because "the organization of an attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects the attorneys' thought processes concerning the litigation." ORD 647 at 5 (citing *National Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993)). However, in this instance, the requestor has not specifically asked for the litigation file. Many of the documents contained in the litigation file appear to be responsive documents that would be maintained by the city outside of this file. Therefore, releasing the information you have indicated is included in the litigation file would not necessarily reveal to the requestor the organization of the file. Consequently, the city may not withhold the marked documents under Rule 192.5 as work product.

We now turn to the remainder of the submitted information. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal*

Found., 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). You have fulfilled the first prong of the test by showing that litigation is currently pending in the United States District Court, Western District of Texas, Austin Division, in *Merlin “Spanky” Handley v. Travis County, Texas, City of Austin, Dinah Dinwiddie, Individually, and in her Official Capacity, and Casey Ping Individually, and in his Official Capacity*, Cause No. A02 CA 606 JN.

We now examine whether the requested information is related to the pending litigation. “Ordinarily, the words ‘related to’ mean ‘pertaining to,’ ‘associated with’ or ‘connected with.’” *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 483 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.). You state that the litigation involves the plaintiff’s employment relationship and his interactions with the city and its employees. Upon reviewing the submitted information we conclude that it relates to the pending litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining documents under section 552.103.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Thus, the city must release the documents that we have marked under section 552.022(a). The city may withhold the remaining documents under section 552.103.

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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Jennifer E. Berry
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 174832

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Tony Plohetski
305 South Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78704
(w/o enclosures)