



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 10, 2006

Ms. Maleshia B. Farmer
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmonton Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2006-00342

Dear Ms. Farmer:

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# 240235.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for an engineer's report of structural damage to a specified residence. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, we note that the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Upon review, we find that the submitted information constitutes a completed report. Pursuant to section 552.022, the city must release this

information unless it is confidential under other law. Although the city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a 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.) (section 552.103 may be waived); Open Records Decision No. 473 (1987) (section 552.111 may be waived). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are not “other law” that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that 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 work product privilege is also found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, we consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information pursuant to rule 192.5.

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 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 the completed report constitutes privileged work product. You state that the documents were prepared in anticipation of litigation. However, the city has not explained that the documents were developed by an attorney or an attorney's representative in anticipation of litigation, and that the documents contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. Rather, the city explains that the report was created by an engineering consultant for the city's use. Thus, we conclude that the city has failed to demonstrate that the completed report constitutes privileged work product. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, 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, 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); *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 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. 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,



Lisa V. Cubriel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LVC/segh

Ref: ID# 240235

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Marlin Rogers
4008 Walton Avenue
Fort Worth, Texas 76133
(w/o enclosures)