



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 8, 2010

Mr. Warren M. S. Ernst  
Chief of the General Counsel Division  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2010-04985

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 375258.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to two specified addresses, specifically including historical information regarding storage tanks, hazardous materials, and environmental violations. You state a portion of the responsive information will be released to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d688, 685 (Tex.1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. Prior decisions of this office have determined that personal financial information not related to a transaction between an individual and a

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

governmental body generally meets the first prong of the common-law privacy test. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See id.* at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure); *see also* Open Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common law privacy), 523 (1989). Whether financial information is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore not protected by common-law privacy must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983). Exhibit B contains a real estate lease agreement for property at a specified address. The city is not a party to this agreement. You seek to withhold the lease payment amount under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we agree this lease payment amount is personal financial information unrelated to a transaction with a governmental body. We therefore conclude the information you marked in Exhibit B is highly intimate and embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no exceptions to disclosure of the other information in Exhibit B, the remaining information must be released.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). 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. 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. *In re Texas 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 a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.*, 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). 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).

You represent the e-mails in Exhibit C were only communicated between and among city attorneys and employees. You state these e-mails were communicated for the purpose of rendering legal advice and opinion to the city. You also state these e-mails have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the e-mails in Exhibit C are privileged, and the city may withhold them under section 552.107.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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,” and 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.

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. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied: (a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue; and (b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See 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.

The information in Exhibit D consists of inspection files, organizational documents, and attorney notes pertaining to properties at one of the specified addresses. You inform this office, and provide documentation showing, that the city brought two lawsuits against those properties pertaining to state ordinance and municipal code violations. You represent the information in Exhibit D was created by city attorneys, city staff, and their agents for use in these enforcement actions. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information in Exhibit D was created in anticipation of litigation or for trial by city attorneys, employees, and their representatives. We therefore conclude this information may be withheld as attorney work product under section 552.111.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you marked in Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information in Exhibit B must be released. The city may withhold the information in Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code, and may also withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.111 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\\_or1.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_or1.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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Bob Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSD/cc

Ref: ID# 375258

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)