ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 7, 2005

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

OR2005-01102

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# 218412.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for the following: 1) any and all contracts for legal services or consultation between the city and a specified attorney and law firm, and 2) the invoices submitted to the city by this attorney and firm. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. However, you claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. You also indicate that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[1]

Initially, we note that the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides in pertinent part:

> (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are

[1] This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling neither reaches nor authorizes the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

> public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:
>
> . . .
>
> (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)(16). Under section 552.022, attorney fee bills must be released unless they are expressly confidential under other law. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and the 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. Accordingly, we will consider your claims pursuant to Rule 503 and Rule 192.5. Furthermore, we will address your claim under section 552.117.

Rule 503(b)(1) 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.

TEX. R. EVID. 503. 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 4527 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You have marked portions of the submitted information that you claim are "communications between outside counsel attorneys or attorney representatives for the City, and attorney representatives for the City and City employees." You also state that the communications at issue were intended to be confidential. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we agree that the information you seek to withhold from the submitted fee bills is protected by the attorney-client privilege and is therefore excepted from disclosure pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

We next address your claim under Rule 192.5 with respect to the remaining information in the submitted attorney fee bills. Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For the purpose of section 552.022(a), information is confidential under Rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). 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 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contain 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).

You contend that portions of the submitted information constitute attorney work product. You state that these documents were prepared by the city's attorneys or their representatives in anticipation of litigation, and that these documents contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or attorney's representative. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the city may withhold the information you have marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Finally, you contend that a portion of the submitted information must be withheld under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure a peace officer's home address, home telephone number, personal pager number, social security number, and information indicating whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the officer complies with section 552.024 or section 552.1175. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, we conclude that the city must withhold the information that you have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The remaining 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,

Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 218412

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jordan Smith
Austin Chronicle
4000 North IH-35
Austin, Texas 78751
(w/o enclosures)