



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 19, 2007

Ms. YuShan Chang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston Legal Department
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2007-13732

Dear Ms. Chang:

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# 292626.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for all information relating to the demolition of specified property and copies of all claims for damages related to the demolition of buildings since 1997. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹We note that you failed to raise section 552.136 within the ten business day deadline mandated in section 552.301(b). See Gov't Code § 552.301(b). However, because section 552.136 is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider your arguments under this exception. See Gov't Code § 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).

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 note that some of the information submitted in Exhibit 3 is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in part:

(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;

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3). The submitted information includes a completed report and information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the city's receipt or expenditure of funds. Therefore, this information must be released under section 552.022 unless it is confidential under other law. You claim that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, which are discretionary exceptions that protect the 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103 subject to waiver), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.111 subject to waiver). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are not other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Consequently, the city may not withhold the information that is subject to 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, 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). The city asserts that the attorney work product privilege applies to this information. Thus, we will determine whether the information subject to section 552.022 is confidential as attorney work product under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Procedure.

The attorney work product privilege is found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Information subject to section 552.022 is “expressly confidential” for purposes of that section under Rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the privilege. ORD 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).

In order to withhold attorney 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. ORD 677 at 6-7. 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 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 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).

Upon review, we find that the city has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue was created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Further, the city has not shown that these documents reveal an attorney's or an attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Accordingly, these documents may not be withheld under Rule 192.5.

You claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in part:

- (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 that raises section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information *and* (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.”³ *Id.* This office has concluded that a governmental body’s receipt of a claim letter that it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor that we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996).

You inform us that the city has received a notice of claim form that complies with the Texas Tort Claims Act. You also state that the city received the notice of claim prior to its receipt of this request for information. You have submitted a copy of the notice of claim. Based on your representations and our review of the notice of claim, we find that you shown that the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of its receipt of this request for information. You state that the information contained in Exhibits 2 and 3 consists of the city’s investigation and legal claim files for the emergency demolition of the property at issue. You

³Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”), *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

state that the information in Exhibit 4 consists of prior claims filed against the city for the demolition of buildings. Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the city may withhold Exhibits 2 and 4 and the remainder of Exhibit 3 under section 552.103.⁴

In reaching this conclusion, we assume that the opposing party in the anticipated litigation has not seen or had access to the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to the litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing party has seen or had access to information that relates to anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding the information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Furthermore, the applicability of section 552.103 ends when the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, other than information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you claim no other exceptions to disclosure, 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

⁴As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining arguments.

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 292626

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Allison Goodwin Holland
Siegel, Yuen & Honore, LLC
P.O. Box 422033
Houston, Texas 77242
(w/o enclosures)