



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 17, 2010

Ms. Andrea Sheehan
Ms. Elisabeth A. Donley
Law Offices of Robert E. Luna, P.C.
For Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD
4411 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75205

OR2010-08896

Dear Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Donley:

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# 383264.

The Carrollton-Farmers Branch Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all statements and itemized invoices for legal services on behalf of the district performed by a specified law office for the month of May 2008. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You indicate the district is redacting some of the responsive information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ 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.

¹We note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") informed this office that FERPA, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a), does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code, which provides that information in a bill for attorney's fees must be released unless it is privileged under the attorney-client privilege or is expressly confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). The Texas Supreme Court has held 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). Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information at issue.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You claim that the submitted attorney fee bills are confidential in their entirety under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. 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 Decision Nos. 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).

You also state that portions of the submitted attorney fee bills document communications between the district’s attorneys and their clients that were made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state that the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. You have identified the parties to the communications in the submitted attorney fee bills. Accordingly, we agree the district may withhold most of the information you have highlighted in green on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.² However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you have highlighted in green reveals communications between privileged parties. Accordingly, except for the information we have marked for release, the district may withhold the information you have highlighted in green pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

We next address your argument under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information you seek to withhold within the submitted attorney fee bills. Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information may be withheld under rule 192.5 only to the extent that the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. 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).

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

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 contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test may be withheld 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). *See* Caldwell, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You contend that the attorney fee bills contain attorney work product that is protected by rule 192.5. However, you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information you have highlighted in pink in the submitted fee bills consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. We therefore conclude that the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary, except for the information we have marked for release, the district may withhold the information you have highlighted in green under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The remaining information must be released.

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_ori.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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nneka Kanu', written in a cursive style.

Nneka Kanu
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NK/jb

Ref: ID# 383264

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)