



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 3, 2005

Ms. Beverly West Stephens  
Gale, Wilson & Sánchez  
115 East Travis, Suite 618  
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2005-00038

Dear Ms. Stephens:

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# 216045.

The South San Antonio Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information relating to charges for legal services regarding the principal at a named elementary school and/or that school during a specified time interval. You seek to withhold some of the requested information under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and have reviewed the information you submitted. We also have considered the comments that we received from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (any person may submit written comments stating why information at issue in request for attorney general decision should or should not be released).

We first note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides that

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:

...

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

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (16). In this instance, the submitted information is contained in vouchers relating to expenditure of public funds by the district and in the district's bills for attorney's fees. Consequently, the district must release the submitted information under section 552.022, unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to public disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under Gov't Code § 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 630 at 4 (1994) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103 subject to waiver), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.111 subject to waiver). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are not "other law" that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. The district also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client and attorney work-product privileges.<sup>1</sup> This office has concluded, however, that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111 or under section 552.101 on the basis of the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work product privilege.

The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney-client privilege is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the attorney work product privilege is found at Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Therefore, we will address your attorney-client and attorney work product privilege claims under rules 503 and 192.5.

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 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 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.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, 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 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). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You contend that portions of the requested attorney fee bills are protected by the attorney-client privilege. You inform us that the information at issue relates to privileged communications between attorneys for and representatives of the district. You state that the

district has not waived the attorney-client privilege with regard to these communications. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we have marked the information that the district may withhold under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For the purpose of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent that 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 that the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation 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 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 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 that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's 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 that 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, no writ).

You contend that some of the remaining information is protected by the attorney work product privilege. You state that the information in question reveals mental processes, conclusions, and legal theories of attorneys that were developed in anticipation of litigation. Based on your representations and our review of the remaining information that you claim is privileged, we have marked the information that the district may withhold under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary: (1) the district may withhold the marked information that is confidential under Texas Rule of Evidence 503; (2) the district may also withhold the marked information that

is confidential under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5; and (3) the rest of the submitted information must be released.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J.W. Morris, III', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWM/krl

Ref: ID# 216045

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Tom Cummins  
Bexar County Federation of Teachers  
1411 North Main  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4306  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Martha P. Owen  
Wiseman, Durst & Owen  
1004 West Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-2019  
(w/o enclosures)