



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 26, 2009

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

OR2009-02526

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# 335905.

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district") received a request for a copy of the district logo and all legal billing statements or invoices for the district for a specified time period. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111 of the Government Code, privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, and protected by copyright law. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that some of the information at issue consists of attorney's fee bills and thus is subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege," unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). You assert that information contained in the submitted fee bills is protected from disclosure by sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 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 Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5

(2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, the district may not withhold information contained in the submitted fee bills under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and 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). Therefore, we will determine whether the district may withhold any of the information in the attorney fee bills under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 or Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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 claim that the fee bills in their entirety are confidential under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides that information “that is *in* a bill for attorney’s fees” is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See* ORD No. 676 (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)); 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney’s legal advice). This office has found that only information that is specifically demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege or made confidential by other law may be withheld from fee bills. *See* ORD No. 676. You have also marked information in the submitted fee bills that you claim consists of confidential attorney-client communications that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You have identified most of the parties to the communications. You state that these communications have remained confidential and have not been revealed to any third party. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that some of the information you have marked reveals confidential communications made between privileged parties. However, the remaining information you have marked does not constitute or reveal communications between privileged parties. Accordingly, we have marked the information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and may therefore be withheld pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district may not withhold any of the remaining information 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 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 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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information subject to section 552.022 consists of core work product for purposes of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under rule 192.5.

You state that the submitted logo is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990)*. Thus, any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The remaining information must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public

information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Greg Henderson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Greg Henderson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

GH/jb

Ref: ID#335905

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)