



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 26, 2014

Mr. Robert Ray
Assistant City Attorney
City of Longview
P.O. Box 1952
Longview, Texas 75606

OR2014-05069

Dear Mr. Ray:

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# 517761.

The City of Longview (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the city's proposed expansion of a specified street. You state you will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion 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:

¹Although you raise Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney work product privilege in this instance is section 552.111 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision No. 677 (2002).

...

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

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information contains a contract relating to the expenditure of public funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 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. 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 subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence 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 assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence to the information that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3). We will also address your arguments against disclosure 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.

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 the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code should be withheld under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. You assert the information at issue consists of an attachment to a privileged attorney-client communication between the city’s attorneys and city employees in their capacities as clients. You state the communication at issue was made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. You also state the communication at issue has not been, and was not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. We note, however, this attachment has been shared with non-privileged parties. Furthermore, this attachment is separately responsive to the request. Therefore, to the extent this attachment exists separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail communication to which it is attached, the city may not withhold it under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. If this attachment does not exist separate and apart from the privileged communication to which it is attached, the city may withhold it under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) 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. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You inform us the city is currently involved in a dispute regarding a specified tract of land within the city. You state the city passed a resolution to extend a specified public street and the requestor’s client owns the tract of land on which a portion of the proposed extension would be constructed. You inform us the city offered to purchase the specified tract of land in order to carry out the proposed extension. You state, and provide documentation showing, that prior to the instant request for information, the city received a letter from the property

owner's attorney expressly rejecting the city's offer to purchase the tract of land at issue. You also state the letter challenges the public necessity for the city's acquisition of the specified tract of land. We further note this communication promises to defend the property owner against any possible legal action by the city. You further inform us the property owner has expressed his intention to sue the city on multiple occasions. Based on your representations, our review, and the totality of circumstances presented, we determine the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the instant request for information. Furthermore, we find the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, we conclude section 552.103 of the Government Code is generally applicable to the remaining information.

We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to some of 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 seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Upon review, we find the information we have marked has been seen by the opposing party and may not be withheld under section 552.103. Therefore, with the exception of the information we have marked, the city may withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.² We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

You claim section 552.111 of the Government Code for the information seen by the opposing party. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "[a]n 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,

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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.

You claim the information at issue is protected by the attorney work product privilege. As noted above, the information at issue consists of communications with the opposing party to the litigation. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney work product privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503, if the marked information does not exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communication to which it is attached. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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,



Lana L. Freeman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LLF/bhf

Ref: ID# 517761

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)