



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 30, 2012

Ms. Annalisa Davila
Deputy Director
West Texas Community Supervision and Corrections Department
800 East Overland, Suite 100
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2012-04659

Dear Ms. Davila:

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# 449213.

The West Texas Community Supervision and Corrections Department (the “department”) received a request for (1) documents reflecting amounts paid for legal fees by the department since January 1, 2011, to the date of the request; (2) documents reflecting bills and invoices to the department for legal work during the same specified period; (3) contracts or agreements with a specified business; (4) documents reflecting the amounts paid to the specified business during the specified time period; and (5) documents reflecting bills and invoices from the specified business during the specified period. You state you have released information responsive to items 1 and 4 of the request. You also state you have notified the requestor the department does not have information responsive to item 3 of the request.¹ You claim a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. You also state the release of portions of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of certain third parties. Accordingly, you notified The Human Element of Business,

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. 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), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Inc. (“Element”) and Kemp Smith, LLP (“Kemp”) of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Kemp. Thus, we have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Element. Thus, Element has failed to demonstrate that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)–(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5–6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Element may have in the information.

Next, we note, the submitted information contained in Tabs 3 and 4 consists of information subject to section 552.022(a) of the Government Code, which provides in part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

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

...

(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)(3), (16). In this instance, the submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the expenditure of public funds by the department and information in attorney fee bills. Thus, the department must release this information pursuant to subsections 552.022(a)(3) and 552.022(a)(16) unless the information is confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(3), (16). Although

you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code for this information, these are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Act of May 30, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 602, §§ 3-21, 23-26, 28-37 (providing for “confidentiality” of information under specified exceptions); *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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney work-product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111). Therefore, the department may not withhold the information at issue under 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 purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 as well as the applicability of the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. In addition, Kemp raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for this information, which protects information made confidential under other law, and section 552.110 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110 (providing for “confidentiality” of trade secrets and certain commercial or financial information under section 552.110). Therefore, we will consider the submitted claims under sections 552.101 and 552.110. Further, we note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Because this section makes information confidential under the Act, we will address its applicability to the submitted information as well.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) 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

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 it is 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 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. 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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

The department and Kemp claim the submitted attorney fee bills are privileged in their entirety under rule 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 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).

The department asserts the information at issue consists of information communicated by attorneys for the department or their representatives to the department and its representative. You explain this information describes legal services provided by the attorney for the client. You also state all of the information at issue consists of communications that were intended to be confidential and have remained so. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked may be withheld under rule 503. We note, however, you have failed to identify some of the parties to these communications. *See Open*

Records Decision No. 676 at 8 (2002) (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). Further, some of the remaining information does not reveal the content of a communication or is a communication with a non-privileged party. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue documents privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, this information is not privileged under rule 503 and may not be withheld on this basis.

The department and Kemp also claim the information in Tabs 3 and 4 are privileged in their entirety under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Rule 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 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 the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *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 (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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You assert the remaining information in Tabs 3 and 4 should be withheld under rule 192.5. Having considered your arguments regarding the information at issue, we conclude the department has failed to demonstrate any of this information consists of the mental

impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. Therefore, we conclude the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Kemp claims section 552.110(b) of the Government Code for the remaining information in Tabs 3 and 4. This exception protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to "commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." Gov't Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We understand Kemp to argue some of its information is excepted under section 552.110(b) based on the holding in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Kemp's interest in its information.

Kemp contends that the submitted invoices are commercial or financial information, release of which would cause competitive harm. Kemp argues disclosure of its rates and the amount of time spent on certain services would give competitors an advantage by allowing competitors to under bid for services. We note the pricing information of a government contractor is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b) because we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices charged by a government contractor. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government).

Upon review of Kemp's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find Kemp has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial damage to Kemp's competitive position. Thus, Kemp has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information. *See* ORD 661. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b).

Next, we address Kemp's argument under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for its remaining information. 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681–82. The type of information considered highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990) (corporation has no right to privacy). Upon review, we find that no portion of Kemp's information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information about an individual. Accordingly, no portion of this information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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, 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,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/dls

Ref: ID# 449213

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerald G. Howard
Kent Smith, L.L.P.
221 North Kansas, Suite 1700
El Paso, Texas 79901
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sandi Smith
President
The Human Element of Business, Inc.
5927 Gateway Boulevard West, Suite A
El Paso, Texas 79925
(w/o enclosures)