



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2012

Mr. Warren M. S. Ernst
Chief of the General Counsel Division
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2012-20378

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 474858.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for records related to a specified claim number. You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

We note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[.]" unless the information is confidential under the Act or other law or is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). In this instance, the information at issue consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government

¹We assume the "representative sample" of information 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.

Code, these sections are discretionary in nature 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. 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has held 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). We will therefore consider your assertions of the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the submitted information.

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 is confidential 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 and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *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 there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance 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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You argue the submitted information consists of privileged attorney work product. You state the information was prepared by city employees in the course of preparing for anticipated

litigation. In Open Records Decision No. 677, our office held information created in a governmental body's ordinary course of business may be considered to have been prepared in anticipation of litigation, and thus constitutes attorney work product, if the governmental body explains to this office the primary motivating purpose for the routine practice that gave rise to the information. See Open Records Decision No. 677 at 8 (2002); see also *Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d at 206. You have not demonstrated the city's primary motivating purpose for the creation of the information at issue was anticipation of litigation. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the city anticipated litigation when creating the submitted information. Further, we find you have not explained how the submitted information consists of "the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative[.]" Therefore, we find the submitted information is not core attorney work product for purposes of rule 192.5 and may not be withheld on that basis. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the submitted 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,



Jennifer Burnett
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/tch

Ref: ID# 474858

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)