



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 19, 2007

Mr. Jesús Toscano, Jr.
Administrative Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2007-12160

Dear Mr. Toscano:

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# 289565.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the itemized bills for legal services from two specified law firms pertaining to a specified lawsuit. The requestor also seeks any focus group, mock jury, or jury expert reports that the city used to assess its risk in a specified lawsuit. You state that the city has released a portion of the requested information. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under rules 192.3 and 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rules 192.3, 192.5 and 503, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

²We assume that 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.

Initially, we address your obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. This section prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires the governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions to disclosure not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state that the city received the present request on July 2, 2007. However, you did not raise rule 192.3 until July 24, 2007. Therefore, the city failed to raise rule 192.3 within the ten-business-day deadline prescribed by section 552.301(b).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Rule 192.3(e) provides a privilege against discovery that is subject to waiver. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 511; *Jordan v. Court of Appeals*, 701 S.W.2d 644, 649 (Tex. 1985); *Arkla, Inc. v. Harris*, 846 S.W.2d 623, 630 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding); *Aetna Cas. & Surety Co. v. Blackmon*, 810 S.W.2d 438, 440 (Tex. Civ. App.—Corpus Christi 1991, writ denied). Accordingly, the city's claim under rule 192.3(e) does not provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure for purposes of section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982); *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 10 (2002) (claim of attorney work-product privilege under TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5 does not provide compelling reason for non-disclosure if claim does not implicate third party rights). Consequently, the city may not withhold Exhibit E under rule 192.3.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides in part that:

(a) 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:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or 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)(1), (16). In this instance, Exhibit D consists of attorney fee bills and Exhibit E is a completed report. Therefore, this information must be released under section 552.022 unless it is confidential under other law. Sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *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 Nos. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived), 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, Exhibits D and E may not be withheld under sections 552.103 and 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 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your arguments under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and 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). 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 represent that Exhibit D contains confidential communications between the city's outside legal counsel and the city made for the purposes of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state that Exhibit D was not intended to be disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of Exhibit D, we find that the information we have marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that may be withheld under rule 503. Some of the remaining information, however, does not consist of or reveal confidential attorney-client communications. Further, you do not explain the city's relationship with, or the capacities of, some of the parties involved in the remaining communications for which you claim this privilege. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information documents privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information may be withheld 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 when the governmental body received the request for information 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 may be withheld 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). *Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You state that Exhibit D “reveals the mental impressions of the city’s outside counsel as they prepared for trial in the [l]awsuit.” You also state that Exhibit E was prepared by the city’s consultant in preparation for trial. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we conclude you have established that portions of the information in Exhibit D, which we have marked, and Exhibit E constitute privileged attorney work product that may be withheld under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. However, we conclude that the remaining information you have marked in Exhibit D does not consist of privileged core work product; therefore, the city may not withhold this information under rule 192.5.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may also withhold the additional information we have marked in Exhibit D and Exhibit E pursuant to rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The remaining submitted information 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, 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,



Melanie J. Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/jb

Ref: ID# 289565

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael Grabell
The Dallas Morning News
P.O. Box 655237
Dallas, Texas 75265
(w/o enclosures)