



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 11, 2011

Mr. Quentin D. Price  
First Assistant City Attorney  
City of Beaumont  
P.O. Box 3827  
Beaumont, Texas 77704-3827

OR2011-04907

Dear Mr. Price:

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# 416128.

The City of Beaumont (the "city") received a request for a copy of the legal bills the city incurred to litigate a case involving a named police officer. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022 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). Although you assert this information is excepted under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections 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 6 (2002) (section 552.107 is not other law for purposes of section 552.022), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived);

*see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are not other law that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022; therefore, the city may not withhold the fee bills under either of these sections. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Section 552.101 also constitutes other law for purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, we will consider your arguments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503, Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, and section 552.101.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The city asserts the submitted information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Texas Rules of Disciplinary Conduct and the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, section 552.101 does not encompass these rules because they are not constitutional law, statutory law, or judicial decisions. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 on those grounds.

You assert some of the requested information is privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Rule 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must do the following: (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You claim the submitted fee bill is confidential in its entirety. 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." *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). Accordingly, section 552.022(a)(16), by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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).

You state the attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between the city's attorneys and certain named city employees. You state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you indicate the fee bills were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We note, however, you have failed to identify some of the parties to the communications in the attorney fee bills. *See* ORD 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made; this office cannot necessarily assume that communication was made only among categories of individuals identified in rule 503). We find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information documents confidential communications that were made between privileged parties. Therefore, we conclude Texas Rule of Evidence 503 is not applicable to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold it on this basis.

For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. Open Records Decision No. 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). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate 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. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show 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 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 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). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have not established the remaining information consists of privileged core attorney work product; therefore, the city may not withhold this information under rule 192.5.

To conclude, the city may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city must release the remaining information to the requestor.

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/tf

Ref: ID# 416128

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)