



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 3, 2007

Mr. Thomas B. Scollon  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2007-00062

Dear Mr. Scollon:

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# 268341.

The City of Haltom City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for copies of billing statements from a named law firm for services provided to the city from June 2006 to September 2006. You claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

First, we note, and you acknowledge, 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 of the Government Code 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). We will therefore consider your arguments under Rules 503 and 192.5.

Texas Rule of Evidence 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 [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state that “[t]he information at issue documents privileged confidential communications between attorneys for and representatives of the [c]ity.” Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the information you have marked is protected by the attorney-client privilege. Accordingly, the city may withhold this information pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we find the remaining information in the submitted attorney fee bills is not protected by the attorney-client privilege and may not be withheld on that basis.

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 inform us that portions of the information in the submitted fee bills relate to current litigation. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have demonstrated that the information you have marked is protected under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and the city may withhold it on that basis. However, the remaining information in the fee bills is not protected under rule 192.5.

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 remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Shelli Egger". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Sincerely,".

Shelli Egger  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SE/sdk

Ref: ID# 268341

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim Moore  
4917 Madella Street  
Haltom City, Texas 76117  
(w/o enclosures)