



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 12, 2013

Mr. Francisco J. Valenzuela  
Counsel for the City of Keene  
Fanning Harper Martinson Brandt & Kutchin, P.C.  
4849 Greenville Avenue, Suite 1300  
Dallas, Texas 75206

OR2013-21699

Dear Mr. Valenzuela:

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# 508404 (FHMBK File No. 26113).

The City of Keene (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for four categories of information regarding a specified property.<sup>1</sup> You state the city is making some information available for inspection by the requestor. You also state the city will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

Initially, we note you have marked some of the submitted information as not responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, we note the submitted information contains copies of city ordinances. As laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records), 221 at 1 (1979) (official records of governmental body's public proceedings are among most open of records). Therefore, the submitted ordinances, which we have marked, must be released.

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant 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:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body; [and]

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (16). The submitted information contains a check that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3) and attorney fee bills that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(16), which must be released unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.107(1) and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.107(1)

---

<sup>3</sup>We 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.

and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.107(1) or section 552.111. However, 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. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your claim of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the information subject to section 552.022. Additionally, as section 552.136 can make information confidential under the Act, we will also address the applicability of that section to the information subject to section 552.022.<sup>4</sup> Finally, we will address your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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.

---

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 assert portions of the information subject to section 552.022 should be withheld under rule 503. You assert the information at issue includes privileged attorney-client communications between the city's outside counsel and city officials and staff in their capacities as clients. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. You further state the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the information we have marked under rule 503 constitutes attorney-client communications. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>5</sup> However, we find you have not demonstrated how the remaining information at issue documents an attorney-client communication for purposes of rule 503. Additionally, the remaining information at issue either does not reveal communications or documents communications with an individual you have not identified as privileged. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information at issue, and the city may not withhold it under rule 503.

We next address Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information in the submitted attorney fee bills. 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).

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You assert the remaining information in the attorney fee bills contain attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information in the submitted attorney fee bills under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for portions of the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

As noted above, you inform us some of the remaining information, which you have marked, consists of communications between the city's outside counsel, city officials and staff in their

capacities as clients, and city consultants. You indicate the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibits 5, 7, 8, and 9. Thus, the city may generally withhold the e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup> We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails and attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note the check subject to section 552.022, the non-privileged e-mail, and some of the non-privileged attachments contain information subject to sections 552.101, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states "[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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); see *id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Thus, the city must withhold

---

<sup>6</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

the bank account, bank routing, and access device numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>7</sup>

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.<sup>8</sup> *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may generally withhold the information in Exhibits 5, 7, 8, and 9 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the non-privileged e-mail and attachments we have marked exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, they may not be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the non-privileged e-mails and attachments exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, the city must withhold the information we have marked under: (1) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) section 552.136 of the Government Code; and (3) section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release. With regards to the check subject to section 552.022, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open\\_orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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

---

<sup>7</sup>Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

<sup>8</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Fabian". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/tch

Ref: ID# 508404

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)