



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 21, 2011

Ms. Bertha Bailey Whatley
Chief Legal Counsel
Fort Worth Independent School District
100 North University Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2011-13659

Dear Ms. Whatley:

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# 430647.

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for a specified deposition and legal fees charged to and paid by the district relating to specified grievance and whistle blower cases. We understand you to claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although you raise section 552.022 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, that provision is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are expressly confidential under "other law." *See* Gov't Code § 552.022. Furthermore, although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, you have provided no arguments regarding the applicability of this section. Since you have not submitted arguments concerning section 552.101, we assume you no longer urge this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(b), (e), .302.

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note Attachment A 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 portions of the submitted attorney fee bills under sections 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* 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 552.107 and 552.111 are not other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(16), and the district may not withhold any of Attachment A under these exceptions. However, 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 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 encompasses 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 in Attachment A documents communications between the district’s attorneys and district staff or officials that were made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, the remaining information you have marked either reveals a communication with a non-privileged party or does not reveal the content of a communication. *See* ORD 676. Thus, the remaining information is not privileged under rule 503, and the district may not withhold it on that basis.

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 in Attachment A constitutes attorney work product protected by rule 192.5. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have not demonstrated that any of the information you have marked constitutes privileged attorney work product, and the district may not withhold it on the basis of rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

You seek to withhold Attachment C under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990)*. A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the

governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); ORD 551 at 4. A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You provide documentation showing that, prior to the district's receipt of the present request for information, a lawsuit styled *Aracely Chavez v. Fort Worth Independent School District*, No. DC-10-02108-I, was filed and is currently pending in the 162nd District Court of Dallas County, Texas. Furthermore, you state Attachment C relates to the substance of this litigation. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the district received the present request for information. We also find Attachment C relates to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103.

We note, however, Attachment C consists of an oral deposition of the district's superintendent at the insistence of the opposing party's counsel. We further note the counsel for the opposing party conducted the deposition. Therefore, the opposing party in the pending litigation has seen or had access to the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. See ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, because the opposing party has seen or had access to the deposition, there is no interest in withholding this information from public disclosure under section 552.103. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Therefore, Attachment C is not protected by section 552.103, and the district may not withhold it on that basis.

We note a portion of the information in Attachment C is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both elements of the test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

review, we find a portion of Attachment C, which we have marked, is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, the district must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note a portion of the remaining information in Attachment C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court recently held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010). Having carefully reviewed the remaining information, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the remaining information in Attachment C may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for an employee who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

In summary, the district may withhold the information in Attachment A we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district must withhold the information in Attachment C we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information in Attachment C we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information in Attachment C we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely elected to keep that personal information confidential. The district 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mack T. Harrison". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/em

Ref: ID# 430647

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)