



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 7, 2005

Mr. Jim A. Martinez
Assistant City Attorney
City Attorney's Office
2 Civic Center Plaza
El Paso, Texas 79901-1196

OR2005-08163

Dear Mr. Martinez:

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# 231628.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for "all outstanding invoices that have not been paid to law firms, private attorneys and any outside (legal) consultants." You state that the city has made some information available to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills, which are 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: . . . (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). Therefore, information within these fee bills may only be withheld if it is confidential under other law.

Sections 552.107 and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions to public disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (attorney work product privilege may be waived), 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). As such, sections 552.107 and 552.111 do not qualify as other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted attorney fee bills under section 552.107 or 552.111 of the Government Code.

However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that makes information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *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. We will therefore consider your arguments under Rules 503 and 192.5 for the information that is subject to section 552.022.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must do the following: (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 assert that the submitted information consists of legal advice given by attorneys to their client, the city, as well as client confidences. We understand you to assert that the submitted fee bills contain confidential communications between representatives of the city and its attorneys. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the submitted attorney fee bills contain information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We have marked the information the city may withhold pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We note, however, that you have failed to identify some of the parties to the communications in the submitted attorney fee bills. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made; this office cannot necessarily assume that these communications were made only among categories of individuals identified in Rule 503). Further, you have not shown that other information that you seek to withhold under rule 503 consists of communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, we find that you have not demonstrated the applicability of Rule 503 for the remaining information. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (stating that predecessor to Act places burden on governmental body to establish why and how exception applies to requested information); *see also Strong v. State*, 773 S.W.2d 543, 552 (Tex. Crim. App. 1989) (burden of establishing attorney-client privilege is on party asserting it).

For the purpose of section 552.022, 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 when the governmental body received the request for information 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 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).

You inform us that the information in the submitted fee bills "was created in exploration and anticipation of litigation." Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have demonstrated that the information we have marked is protected under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, and the city may withhold it on that basis.

We note that the submitted attorney fee bills contain information that is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has additionally found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987)

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have marked the information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

We also note that the remaining submitted information contains credit card and other account numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. The city must, therefore, withhold the marked account numbers under section 552.136.

In summary, the submitted attorney fee bills must be released to the requestor, except for the information that we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, and the marked account numbers must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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 Office of the Attorney General 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,



Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/sdk

Ref: ID# 231628

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sidney Maven
c/o Jim A. Martinez
City Attorney's Office
2 Civic Center Plaza
El Paso, Texas 79901-1196
(w/o enclosures)