



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 9, 2012

Ms. Janet I. Monteros
Assistant County Attorney
El Paso County
500 East San Antonio, Room 503
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2012-03615

Dear Ms. Monteros:

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# 448127 (# OP-12-003).

The El Paso County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for the district attorney's office's entire file regarding a specified case. You state you will release some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.114, 552.130, 552.1325, and 552.147 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a certificate of magistrate that was signed by a magistrate. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the district attorney's office seeks to withhold this information under

¹We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas 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. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold the certificate of magistrate under section 552.103 or section 552.108. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). However, the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure apply only to "actions of a civil nature." *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 2. Thus, because the submitted information relates to a criminal case, the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure does not apply in this instance. However, we will consider the applicability of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and we will also address your arguments for the remainder of the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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 it is 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 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 argue the certificate of magistrate subject to section 552.022(a)(17) is privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, you have not explained, nor can we discern, how the certificate of magistrate consists of a privileged attorney-client communication. Accordingly, the information at issue may not be withheld under rule 503. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised for this information, the certificate of magistrate, which we have marked, must be released to the requestor.

We next address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022. 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); 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 that 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.

The work product doctrine under section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. 1994); see *U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). In *Curry*, the Texas Supreme Court held that a request for a district attorney’s “entire file” was “too broad” and, citing *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held that “the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney’s thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case.”² *Id.* at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney’s entire litigation file, and a governmental body demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume that the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996); see *Nat'l Union*, 863 S.W.2d at 461 (organization of attorney’s litigation file necessarily reflects attorney’s thought processes).

You contend that the request for information encompasses the district attorney’s office’s entire file concerning this case. Upon review, we determine that the district attorney’s office may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 as attorney work-product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.³

In summary, the district attorney’s office must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The district attorney’s office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

²We note, however, that the court in *National Union* also concluded that a specific document is not automatically considered to be privileged simply because it is part of an attorney’s file. 863 S.W.2d at 461. The court held that an opposing party may request specific documents or categories of documents that are relevant to the case without implicating the attorney work product privilege. *Id.*; Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996).

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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 'Sarah Casterline', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/som

Ref: ID# 448127

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)