



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 15, 2008

Mr. Charles K. Eldred
Public Information Coordinator
Texas Youth Commission
P.O. Box 4260
Austin, Texas 78765

OR2008-00743

Dear Mr. Eldred:

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# 299676.

The Texas Youth Commission (the "commission") received a request for specified invoices. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.²

Initially, we note that much of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information. The request seeks specific invoices

¹Although you initially raised section 552.103 of the Government Code, you have not submitted any arguments regarding the applicability of this exception nor have you identified any information you seek to withhold under this exception. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this exception to disclosure. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²We 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.

pertaining to specific dates. Accordingly, any information which does not pertain to the specified invoices is not responsive to the current request. The commission need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

You acknowledge, and we agree, that the remaining information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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:

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body;

...

(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)(3), (16). The remaining information includes invoices and payment vouchers, which are made public under section 552.022(a)(3), and attorney fee bills, which are made public under section 552.022(a)(16). Section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (section 552.107 is not other law for purposes of section 552.022); *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 the purposes of section 552.022; therefore, the commission may not withhold the information at issue under this section. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" that makes information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. We will therefore consider your arguments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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 indicate that the submitted attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between the commission's attorneys and commission representatives that were made for the purposes of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission. You also indicate that the communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the attorney fee bills contain information that reveals confidential communications between privileged parties. Accordingly, we have marked the information that is protected by the

attorney-client privilege and may therefore be withheld pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rule of Evidence. We find, however, that you have not demonstrated the applicability of rule 503 for the remaining information in the fee bills, either because it does not reflect confidential communications, or because you have failed to identify the parties to the communications. *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 communication was made only among categories of individuals identified in rule 503). *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (stating that predecessor to the Act places burden on governmental body to establish why and how exception applies to requested information); *Strong v. State*, 773 S.W.2d 543, 552 (Tex. Crim. App. 1989) (burden of establishing attorney-client privilege is on party asserting it). Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld pursuant to the attorney-client privilege under rule 503.

Next, Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes 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).

Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you not established that the remaining information contains an attorney's or an attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories; therefore, the commission may not withhold the any of the remaining information under rule 192.5.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rule of Evidence. 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 299676

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steve McGonigle
Dallas Morning News
c/o Charles K. Eldred
Public Information Coordinator
Texas Youth Commission
P.O. Box 4260
Austin, Texas 78765
(w/o enclosures)