



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 23, 2008

Ms. Bonnie Lee Goldstein
Bonnie Lee Goldstein, P.C.
P.O. Box 140940
Dallas, Texas 75214-0940

OR2008-14502

Dear Ms. Goldstein:

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# 326569.

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all checks from the city to lawyers or law firms, and all invoices, billing statements, or other documents requesting payment from the city to law firms or lawyers. You claim that the submitted information is privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

You acknowledge that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in part that:

(a) 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; [and]

...

(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). In this instance, the submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the expenditure of public funds as well as attorney fee bills. Thus, the city must release this information pursuant to subsections 552.022(a)(3) and 552.022(a)(16) unless it is expressly confidential under other law. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney client privilege is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the attorney work product privilege is found at Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, we consider your assertion that the information you have highlighted in the attorney fee bills is privileged under rule 503 and rule 192.5.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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).

Thus, 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. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You claim that the fee bills in their entirety are confidential because the fee bills themselves are attorney-client communications. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides that information “that is *in* a bill for attorney’s fees” is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See* Open Records Decisions No. 676 (2002) (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)); 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney’s legal advice). This office has found that only information that is specifically demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege or made confidential by other law may be withheld from fee bills. *See* ORD No. 676. You also have marked information in the submitted fee bills that you claim contains confidential communications between representatives of the city and the city’s outside legal counsel. We note that you have not identified some of the individuals listed in the fee bills. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989) (stating that predecessor statute required governmental body must explain why an exception applied to a particular piece of information). Only communications between the city’s representatives and the city’s legal counsel, and their representatives, may be protected by the attorney-client privilege. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that some of the submitted information is protected by the attorney-client privilege encompassed by rule 503. We have marked the information in the fee bills at issue that you may withhold pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, the city has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining entries in the fee bills document privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis. However, as you also claim that the information in the submitted fee bills contains attorney work product under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we will address this argument for the remaining information that is not confidential under the attorney-client privilege.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent that the information implicates the core work product aspect of

the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* 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 and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information consists of core work product for purposes of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under rule 192.5.

We note that a portion of the remaining documents contain information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.136 provides:

- (a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. We have marked the checking account and routing numbers that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 as it constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication. The checking account and routing numbers we have marked must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining 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 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,



Greg Henderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GH/jh

Ref: ID# 326569

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Marie Biggs
8433 Biggs Road
Princeton, Texas 75407
(w/o enclosures)