



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 2, 2007

Mr. Jeffrey L. Moore
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2007-12796

Dear Mr. Moore:

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 #290561.

The City of Murphy (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the city's involvement with the NBC television program "Dateline." Specifically, the requestor seeks: (1) any and all records of correspondence between the city and NBC; (2) any and all receipts documenting payments from NBC to the city; and (3) any and all records regarding the whereabouts of a computer confiscated by the city's police department as a result of Dateline's operation to catch criminal suspects using the internet. You state that the city does not have any documents responsive to categories 1 and 2 of the request.¹ You state that you have provided the requestor with the search warrant, the return list, and basic, front page information. See Gov't Code § 552.108(c) (stating that basic information about arrested person, arrest, or crime may not be withheld under Gov't Code § 552.108); see also *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

(Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). You claim that the submitted documents are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received correspondence from the requestor's attorney. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

As a preliminary matter, you state that the submitted police incident report and computer forensic analysis report, Exhibits B and C, are the subjects of two prior rulings of this office. In Open Records Letters Nos. 2007-07238 (2007) and 2007-07775 (2007), we concluded that the city may withhold these reports under section 552.108(a)(2), as they pertain to a criminal investigation that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Since the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of those prior rulings, we determine that the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letters No. 2007-07238 (2007) and 2007-07775 (2007) with respect to Exhibits B and C.²

You state that the e-mails and handwritten notes contained in Exhibit D, which you have marked under section 552.107, is information within the scope of the attorney-client privilege. See Gov't Code § 552.107(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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002).

First, a governmental body must demonstrate that 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. 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. *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,

²The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that the information you marked in Exhibit D are communications or records of communications between city attorneys and employees of the city’s police department made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal advice. You also state that these communications were made in confidence, intended for the sole use of the city, and, to your knowledge, have not been shared or distributed to others. Based on our review of your representations and the submitted information, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You assert that the remaining information within Exhibit D is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in pertinent 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). 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 on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law 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 [1st 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 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert that the information you marked under section 552.103 relates to litigation anticipated by the city. You state that the city anticipates litigation because a potential plaintiff against the city has filed a claim against NBC, and the complaint mentions that there are potentially “other defendants.” However, this complaint was not filed until twelve days after the present request for information was received by the city. You do not provide any arguments explaining how the city anticipated litigation on the date the present request for information was received. Furthermore, you acknowledge that the plaintiff’s attorney indicated that his client has no intention to sue the city. Accordingly, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate that it anticipated litigation on the date the request was received. Thus, the city may not withhold the documents you have marked under section 552.103.

Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. OF CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information on this basis bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. *Id.*; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8 (2002). In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied 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 [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *Nat’l Tank Co. 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; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 7 (2002).

You assert that the information you marked under section 552.111 consists of notes prepared by city attorneys relating to conversations with Department of Public Safety officials and the attorney for the decedent’s estate. You state that these notes contain the city attorneys’ mental impressions concerning the return of the decedent’s computer equipment. You do not explain, nor can we discern, how these notes were created for the purpose of preparing for any litigation. Accordingly, you have not demonstrated how these notes are attorney work product, and none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.111.

In summary, the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2007-07238 and 2007-07775 with respect to Exhibits B and C. The city may withhold the information

it has marked within Exhibit D under section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Reg Hargrove", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 290561

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mark Smith
WFAA Producer
606 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Paul C. Walter
Jackson Walker LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 6000
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)