



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 11, 2007

Ms. Susan K. Bohn  
General Counsel  
Lake Travis Independent School District  
3322 Ranch Road 620 South  
Austin, Texas 78738

OR2007-11858

Dear Ms. Bohn:

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# 288790.

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district") received seven requests from the same requestor for candidate submissions for certain job postings as well as copies of information related to the district's legal expenses during a specified period of time. You state that the district will provide the requestor with a portion of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.<sup>1</sup> We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we will address your claim that portions of the submitted information are not responsive to the present request. You contend that the information you have highlighted in pink is not responsive to the present request because it does not pertain to legal expenses accrued by the district between the specified dates. Upon review, we agree that the information highlighted in pink is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise sections 552.102 and 552.117 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments in support of these claims. Thus, we assume that the district no longer asserts sections 552.102 and 552.117 against disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested).

address the public availability of this information, and it need not be released in response to this request.

Next, we note that the information at issue is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Specifically, this section provides that “information that is in a bill for attorney’s fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege” is public and may not be withheld unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16). Thus, information contained in attorney fee bills must be released under section 552.022(a)(16) unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Although you seek to withhold the submitted attorney fee bill under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body’s interests and may be waived. *See id.* § 552.007; *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 Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are not “other law” that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(16). Therefore, the district may not withhold any part of the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that 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). The attorney-client privilege is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the attorney work product privilege is found at Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of these privileges under rule 503 and rule 192.5 with respect to the information in the attorney fee bill.

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 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 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 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 contend that the attorney fee bill at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications between attorneys for the district and upper echelon district employees. You also state that these communications were made to facilitate the rendering of professional legal services to the district and that they were not intended to be disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we have marked the information that the district may withhold on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, the district has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information constitutes confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 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 that the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). 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 that 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 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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that 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 that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You claim that the information at issue constitutes core attorney work product as contemplated by rule 192.5. Although you explain that the information reflects the strategies, research, and preparation of the district's attorneys, upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information is protected by the attorney work product privilege. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under rule 192.5.

In summary, the district may withhold the attorney-client communications that we have marked in accordance with Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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, 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,



Nikki Hopkins  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NH/mcf

Ref: ID# 288790

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David Lovelace  
103 Galaxy  
Austin, Texas 78734  
(w/o enclosures)