



March 13, 2002

Mr. Tim Molina
Assistant Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2002-1209

Dear Mr. Molina:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 159830.

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for any information regarding investigations of a named individual and the Texas Commission for the Blind (the "Commission"). You inform us that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor. However, you claim that portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 of the Government Code makes certain information expressly public. One such category of expressly public information under section 552.022 is "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by [s]ection 552.108[.]" Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Thus, a governmental body must release a completed investigation unless the information is excepted under section 552.108 or is confidential by law. You claim that the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107(1) and 552.111. However, sections 552.107 and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions under the Public Information Act and do not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.¹ See Open Records Decision

¹Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 8 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104, information relating to competition or bidding); 549 at 6 (1990) (governmental body may waive informer's privilege); 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general).

Nos. 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive sections 552.103 and 552.111), 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)). Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under either section 552.107 or section 552.111.

However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that “[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are ‘other law’ within the meaning of section 552.022.” *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the information is confidential under Rule 503.

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.

A communication is “confidential” if 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. Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon

a demonstration of all three factors, the document containing privileged information is 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). In this case, after reviewing the submitted documents, we conclude that you have demonstrated all three factors with respect to a portion of the documents. We have marked the information that may be withheld under Rule 503.

The attorney work product privilege is also found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. An attorney's core work product is confidential under Rule 192.5. Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. 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 that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *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 that 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 National 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

In the instant matter, you do not explain, nor do the documents reflect that the OAG created the marked information for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Consequently, we find that the OAG has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the work product privilege.

We note that the submitted information contains e-mail addresses made confidential under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides in relevant part:

(a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Section 552.137 requires the OAG to withhold 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 has affirmatively consented to its release. As there is no indication that the member of the public consented to release in this instance, the OAG must withhold the e-mail address in the submitted information under section 552.137. We have marked the documents accordingly.

In sum, the OAG may withhold the information we have marked under Rule 503, and it must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.137. The remaining information, however, must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839.

The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Kevin J. White

Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJW/seg

Ref: ID#

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Carl Payne Tobey, Jr.
The Tobey Law Firm
26545 IH 10 West, Suite 100
Boerne, Texas 78006
(w/o enclosures)