



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 27, 2011

Ms. Claire E. Swann  
For Mansfield Independent School District  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2011-10772

Dear Ms. Swann:

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# 425029.

The Mansfield Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified investigation. You state some responsive information will be released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You further state the release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you have notified Byrne Construction of this request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why its submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have considered your claims and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, we note that, in this instance, the proper exception to raise when asserting the work product privilege is section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 (2002).

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Byrne Construction has not submitted to this office reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, Byrne Construction has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that this company may have in the information.

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 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 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *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 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 generally state the information at issue was communicated between district employees and attorneys for the district; it was created for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services; it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons; and the district has not waived its privilege. You have identified most of the parties to the communications. Therefore, based on your representations and our review of the documents, we conclude the information we have marked falls within the protections of the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. With respect to the remaining information, we find you have failed to demonstrate that the information consists of privileged communications made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services. As you have failed to establish the remaining information is privileged under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, it may not be withheld on that basis.

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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception 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); ORD 677 at 4-8. 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 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 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.

Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the remaining information constitutes material prepared, mental impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, we note the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The marked insurance policy numbers must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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\\_orl.php](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

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>We note that Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) was issued by this office as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 425029

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Byrne Construction  
3100 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107  
(w/o enclosures)