



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 12, 2014

Ms. Sharon Alexander
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2014-08031

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 523132.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified motor vehicle collision, including a copy of dispatch and radio transmissions. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

We note the information contains Daily Activity Reports that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in part:

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with other raised exceptions, we note this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act.

²We 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.

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the 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). Although you seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 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, orig. proceeding) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver); *see also* Open Records Decision 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the Daily Activity Reports pursuant to section 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that “other law,” such as the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also Pierce County v. Guillen*, 537 U.S. 129 (2003) (upholding constitutionality of section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code, relied on by county in denying request under state’s Public Disclosure Act). Accordingly, we will consider your attorney-client and attorney work product arguments under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Furthermore, we will consider your claims under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 for information not subject to section 552.022.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

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). 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. First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was "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). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Upon a demonstration of these 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). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You indicate the information at issue consists of communications between the department's staff and attorneys, as well as attorneys and staff of the Transportation Division of the Office

of the Attorney General, that were made to facilitate the rendition of legal services. You state these documents were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. However, we find the Daily Activity Reports are not communications between privileged parties and are separately responsive to the request. Accordingly, to the extent the reports exist separate and apart from the privileged communication to which they are attached, the department may not withhold them under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. If the reports do not exist separate and apart from the privileged communications, the department may withhold them under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

To the extent the reports exist separate and apart from the privileged communications, we will address your argument under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, which 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 it 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 that 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 that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that 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's 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.

Upon review, we find the Daily Activity Reports do not consist of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative prepared in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, to the extent the Daily Activity Reports exist separate

and apart from the privileged communications to which they are attached, they may not be withheld under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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.

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the department's receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Tommy Joe Whatley et. al. vs. Texas Department of Transportation*, Cause No. 1200138, was filed and is currently pending against the department in the 115th/276th Judicial District of Marion County, Texas. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the department received the present request for information. You also state, and upon review we agree, the remaining information pertains to the substance of the lawsuit. Therefore, we conclude the department may withhold the remaining requested information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either

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


been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, 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).

In summary, the department may withhold the Daily Activity Reports pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, if the reports do not exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communications to which they are attached. If the Daily Activity Reports exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communications to which they are attached, the department must release the reports. The department may withhold the remaining requested 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,



Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 523132

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)