



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 9, 2007

Mr. Renaldo L. Stowers
Associate General Counsel
University of North Texas System
P.O. Box 310907
Denton, Texas 76203-0907

OR2007-05602

Dear Mr. Stowers:

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# 277978.

The University of North Texas System (the "system") received a request for fee bills pertaining to a specified investigation of an individual. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and protected under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

You state that some of the requested information, which you have not submitted to this office for review, is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2006-03621 (2006). You also inform us that this information is the subject of a lawsuit filed with respect to the system's claims in OR2006-03621.² As we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

²*University of North Texas System v. Abbott*, Cause No. D-1-GN-06-001406.

based have changed, the system must continue to rely on that ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release the requested information in accordance with OR2006-03621, except with regard to the aspects of the ruling that the system challenged in the lawsuit. We will let the court decide the disposition of that information. For the new information that was not at issue in OR2006-03621, we will address the system's arguments.

Initially, you acknowledge, and we agree, that the submitted fee bills are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) 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. Section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As such, section 552.107 is not other law that makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the system may not withhold the fee bills under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and 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 rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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).

Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established that some of the information you have marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that may be withheld under rule 503. However, we conclude you have not established that the information we have marked for release consists of privileged communications; therefore, the system may not withhold this information under rule 503.

For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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).

Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established that some of the information you have marked constitutes privileged attorney work product that may be withheld under rule 192.5. However, we conclude you have not established that the information we have marked for release consists of privileged attorney work product; therefore, the system may not withhold this information under rule 192.5.

To conclude, the system may withhold the information you have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, with the exception of the information we have marked for release. The system must release the remaining information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(16) 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); *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,



Heather Pendleton Ross
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HPR/sdk

Ref: ID# 277978

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Matthew Zabel
Denton Record-Chronicle
314 East Hickory Street
Denton, Texas 76201
(w/o enclosures)