



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 19, 2006

Ms. Lydia L. Perry  
Law Offices of Robert E. Luna, P.C.  
4411 North Central Expressway  
Dallas, Texas 75205

OR2006-03939

Dear Ms. Perry:

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# 246820.

The Coppell Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information relating to a specified lawsuit, specifically seeking fee statements billed to and/or paid by the district from January 1, 2000, through the date of the request, a description of the services rendered and the amounts charged, and a description and the amounts of the costs and expenses. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.136 of the Government Code, as well as the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.3. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the some of the submitted information does not pertain to the subject matter of the request and thus is not responsive to the present request. Accordingly, the district need not release this information in response to this request, and this ruling only addresses the availability to the requestor of the responsive submitted information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

Next, we note and you acknowledge, that some of the submitted records consist of information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) enumerates categories of information that are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under the Act unless they are expressly confidential under other law and provides in pertinent part:

(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 under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under 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;

...

(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). Under section 552.022, this information must be released unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions under the Act and do not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive section 552.107(1)). Thus, none of the information subject to section 552.022 may be withheld under sections 552.103 or 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has 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, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertions of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information that is subject to 552.022. We will also consider your arguments under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.3 and sections 552.101 and 552.136 for this information.

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 4527 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (Privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You explain that the submitted information contains confidential attorney-client communications that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services to the client district. In addition, you state that these communications were not intended to be disclosed to third persons. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we agree that portions of the submitted fee bills constitute privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, we have marked the information the district may withhold under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We conclude, however, that you have not established that the remaining information subject to section 552.022 consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the district may not withhold this information under Rule 503.

We next address your work product claim under Rule 192.5. For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under Rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. Open

Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). 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 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contain 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).

You explain that some of the entries in the submitted fee bills contain attorney work product that was created while litigation was pending. Further, you explain that some of the information reflects the attorneys' mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Upon review of your arguments, we agree that some of the information at issue is protected attorney work product. We have marked the information that may be withheld under Rule 192.5. However, you have not demonstrated that the remainder of the information consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. We therefore conclude that the district may not withhold the remaining information that is subject to 552.022 under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

We also consider your claim under the consulting expert privilege for information that is subject to section 552.022. The consulting expert privilege is found in Rule 192.3(e) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. A party to litigation is not required to disclose the identity, mental impressions, and opinions of consulting experts. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.3(e). A "consulting expert" is defined as "an expert who has been consulted, retained, or specially employed by a party in anticipation of litigation or in preparation for trial, but who is not a

testifying expert.” TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.7. You indicate that the district contracted for advice and consulting services from several expert consultants in connection with the water project at issue in the request. You further contend that the services provided by the district’s consultants were provided in anticipation of litigation relating to the water project. We understand you to represent that the district does not anticipate calling these experts as witnesses in potential litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find that the information at issue identifies the district’s consulting experts. We therefore find the district may withhold the identifying information, which we have marked, pursuant to Rule 192.3(e) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001).

The section 552.022 documents also contain information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 provides in relevant part:

(a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. The district must withhold the account numbers that you have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We now address your arguments for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. You contend that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. Section 552.103 provides 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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated when the governmental body received the request, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Lcw Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1<sup>st</sup> Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In this instance, you inform us that two civil cases have been filed and were currently pending against the district when the request for information was received. Furthermore, based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that the submitted information relates to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). We therefore conclude that the remaining submitted information may be withheld from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103.

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, Rules 192.5 and 192.3 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and section 552.136 of the Government Code, the information we have marked under section 552.022 of the Government Code must be released. The remaining submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.103.<sup>1</sup>

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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As this ruling is dispositive, we do not address the remaining arguments.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



James Forrest  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JF/er

Ref: ID# 246820

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Eric Aasen  
Staff Writer  
The Dallas Morning News  
P.O. Box 655237  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(w/o enclosures)