



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 4, 2008

Ms. Zindia T. Thomas
Assistant Attorney General
Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2008-12211

Dear Ms. Thomas:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code, the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Your request was assigned ID# 320935.

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for e-mails from March 29 to June 2, 2008 concerning the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, members of the church, and the YFZ Ranch and records generated as a result of the June 11, 2008 meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada, concerning polygamy. The OAG asserts the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the OAG's claimed exceptions to disclosure and have reviewed the submitted sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the Health and Human Services Commission. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments addressing availability of requested information).

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.

First, we note the OAG submitted documents that have been filed with a court. Information that is also contained in a public court record is public information and not excepted from disclosure unless the information is expressly confidential under law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential; therefore, the OAG may not withhold the court records under these exceptions. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney work-product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 473 (1987) (sections 552.103 and 552.111 may be waived). These documents, which we have marked, must therefore be released unless they are expressly made confidential under other law.

The attorney-client and attorney work product privileges are also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, respectively. The Texas Supreme Court held that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are other laws within the meaning of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the OAG may withhold the court records under Rules 503 and 192.5.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

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

(F) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

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. Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 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).

The court records subject to section 552.022(a)(17) are not communications between privileged parties because they have been provided to the opposing parties. Thus, the OAG may not withhold the court records under Rule 503.

Furthermore, 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. ORD 677 at 9-10. 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). Because the documents have been filed with a court and seen by opposing parties, the OAG has waived its privilege under Rule 192.5. See TEX. R. EVID. 511 (stating that a person waives a discovery privilege if he voluntarily discloses the privileged information). Thus, the OAG may not withhold the court-filed documents under Rule 192.5.

Next, we consider the OAG's section 552.107 assertion for the remaining information in Exhibits B, D - F, I, and M. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those for Rule 503 outlined above.

The OAG explains the remaining communications in Exhibits B, D - F, I, and M are confidential communications among OAG attorneys, staff, and client, and they are made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The OAG states the communications were intended to be confidential and that their confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing the OAG's arguments and the submitted information, we agree that all but two of the remaining communications in Exhibits B, D - F, I, and M constitute privileged attorney-client communications that the OAG may withhold under section 552.107.² The two communications are from opposing counsels and therefore are not privileged communications. Thus, the OAG may not withhold the documents we marked under section 552.107. We will consider the OAG's assertions under sections 552.103 and 552.111 for these documents.

Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD 677 at 4-8. Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. ORD 677 at 6-8. Because the OAG received the communications from opposing counsels, the records do not meet the definition of work product. Hence, the OAG may not withhold the information under section 552.111.

Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or

²Because section 552.107 is dispositive, we do not address the OAG's other claimed exceptions for this information.

employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

Gov't Code § 552.103. Section 552.103(a) is applicable upon a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). However, section 552.103(a) was intended to prevent the use of the Act as a method of avoiding the rules of discovery in litigation. Attorney General Opinion JM-1048 at 4 (1989). The litigation exception enables a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by requiring information related to the litigation to be obtained through discovery. Open Records Decision No. 551 at 3 (1990). Thus, no section 552.103(a) interest exists when the information was obtained from or provided to all opposing parties in the litigation. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Again, because the OAG obtained the communications from opposing counsels, who represent all of the opposing parties in the litigation referenced in the records, the OAG may not withhold these records under section 552.103.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.137. Thus, the OAG must withhold the private e-mail address it marked in Exhibit D under section 552.137. Although the OAG asserts section 552.137 for information in Exhibit C, we note this exhibit contains no private e-mail address.

Lastly, the OAG asserts section 552.108 of the Government Code excepts Exhibits J - L from public disclosure. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(a); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977).

The OAG argues section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable because the information relates to a pending criminal case conducted by its Criminal Investigations and Prosecutions Divisions. Based upon this representation, we conclude release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Thus, the OAG may withhold the information under

section 552.108(a)(1). Because section 552.108 is dispositive, we do not address the OAG's other arguments for this information.

In summary, except for the court-filed documents and the documents we marked for release, the OAG may withhold B, D - F, I, and M under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The OAG must withhold the private e-mail address it marked in Exhibit D under section 552.137. The OAG may withhold Exhibits J - L under section 552.108. The OAG must release the remainder.

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 320935

Enc: Marked documents

c: Ms. Brooke Adams
Mr. Nate Carlisle
The Salt Lake Tribune
90 South 400 West, Suite 700
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
(w/o enclosures)