



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 2, 2010

Mr. Thomas A. Gwosdz
City Attorney
City of Victoria
P.O. Box 1758
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2010-16604

Dear Mr. Gwosdz:

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# 398802.

The City of Victoria (the "city") received a request for invoices for legal services provided to the city dated during a specified time period.¹ You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege," unless the information is expressly confidential under "other law." Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Although you seek to withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas*

¹You inform us the city received the present request on August 5, 2010. You state the city provided the requestor with an estimate of charges and requested a deposit on August 6, 2010. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.2615, .263(a). You further inform us the city received a deposit from the requestor on August 17, 2010; thus, that is the date on which the city is deemed to have received the present request. *Id.* § 552.263(e).

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. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are not other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(16), and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under these exceptions. 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). Accordingly, we will address your attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and your attorney work product privilege claim under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the submitted fee bills.

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 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and 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 state the information you have marked as “552.107” documents communications between the city’s attorneys and city officials that were made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state that the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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 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). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (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 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 the information you have marked as "552.111" constitutes attorney work product protected by rule 192.5. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude the information we have marked in the attorney fee bills constitutes privileged attorney work product. Therefore, the city may withhold this information under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. You have not demonstrated, however, that any of the remaining information you have marked constitutes privileged attorney work product, and the city may not withhold it under rule 192.5.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked as "552.107" under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the information we have marked under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The city must release the remaining information.

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/em

Ref: ID# 398802

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)