



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

May 21, 2009

Mr. Craig Magnuson
City Attorney
City of Mansfield
1305 East Broad Street
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2009-06976

Dear Mr. Magnuson:

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# 343722.

The City of Mansfield Police Department (the "department") received a request for animal control information pertaining to a specified address. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* We note that the submitted information includes a citation, which we have marked. Because a copy of the citation has been provided to the individual who was cited, we find that release of the citation will not

¹You also claim that the requested information is protected under the attorney-client privilege based on Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and under the attorney work product privilege based on Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. In this instance, however, because the information at issue is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the information is properly addressed here under section 552.107, rather than rule 503, and section 552.111, rather than rule 192.5. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 3 (2002); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022 (listing categories of information that are expressly public under the Act and must be released unless confidential under "other law"). As such, we address your arguments related to the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 and the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111.

interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Therefore, the department may not withhold the citation under section 552.108(a)(1). You state that the remaining information relates to an open criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of this 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. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88. You must release basic information, including a detailed description of the offense, even if the information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information and the marked citation, you may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1).²

Although basic information and the submitted citation are not excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider whether any of this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 or 552.111. 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. First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1)(A)-(E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each

²We note the information being released includes the requestor's Texas motor vehicle record information, which would ordinarily be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, because this information belongs to the requestor, it may not be withheld in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body to provide him with information concerning himself). If the department receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a decision from this office.

communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “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). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

In this instance, although you generally assert that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to the attorney-client privilege, you have not provided any arguments demonstrating how any of the submitted information constitutes confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the attorney-client privilege is applicable to the remaining information. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

We turn now to section 552.111 to address your claim that the remaining information at issue is protected as attorney work product. Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). 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.

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. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) 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 b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. 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; ORD 677 at 7.

You generally assert that the remaining information is privileged as attorney work product. However, you have not provided any arguments establishing that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue when the information at issue was created. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A). We therefore conclude that the department has failed to establish how any of the submitted information constitutes privileged attorney work product. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111.

In summary, with the exception of basic information and the marked citation, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Bob Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSD/cc

Ref: ID# 343722

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)