



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 16, 2013

Mr. Michael Spurlock
Legal Counsel
Housing Authority of the City of El Paso
P.O. Box 9895
El Paso, Texas 79995-2895

OR2013-12162

Dear Mr. Spurlock:

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# 493285.

The Housing Authority of the City of El Paso (the "authority") received a request for all documentation used, submitted, or created in the course of a specified investigation involving 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 a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the request was received by the authority. This ruling does not address the public availability of the information that is not responsive to the request, and authority is not required to release this information in response to this request.

Next, we note the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides, in pertinent part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The responsive information is part of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Thus, the information at issue must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary exceptions 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, 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 consider your attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and attorney work product privilege claim under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Rule 192.5 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 claim the responsive attorney notes consist of attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. You contend the authority reasonably anticipated litigation at the time the information was created because the requestor had filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (the “EEOC”). *See Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982) (pending complaint before the EEOC indicates a substantial likelihood of potential litigation)*. You state, and the correspondence from the authority’s attorney confirms, the information at issue was created by the attorney in anticipation of defending the authority in the EEOC claim. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative created in anticipation of litigation. Thus, we conclude you have demonstrated the responsive information constitutes core attorney work product. Accordingly, the authority may withhold the responsive information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.¹

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 493285

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)