



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 11, 2014

Mr. Bill Delmore
Assistant District Attorney
Montgomery County District Attorney's Office
207 W. Phillips, 2nd Floor
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2014-04139

Dear Mr. Delmore:

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# 516540.

The Montgomery County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all records pertaining to a specified case. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant 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:

...

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Some of the submitted information consists of court-filed documents that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(17). The district attorney's office must release the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(17) unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the district attorney's office seeks to withhold this information under sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the court-filed documents we have marked may not be withheld under section 552.108 or section 552.111. We note the attorney work-product privilege is found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, which has been held to be other law within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). However, those rules are applicable only to "actions of a civil nature." *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 2. Thus, because the court-filed documents pertain to a criminal case, rule 192.5 is not applicable to this information. Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of the attorney work-product privilege in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. However, because sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will address their applicability to the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17).² Further, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

We first address your claim under section 552.111 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. 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 exception 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); ORD 677 at 4-8. 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,

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception 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.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

a) 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 b) 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; ORD 677 at 7.

The work product doctrine under section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. 1994); see *U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). In *Curry*, the Texas Supreme Court held that a request for a district attorney's "entire file" was "too broad" and, citing *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held that "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case."³ *Id.* at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file, and a governmental body demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume that the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. ORD 647 at 5; see *Nat'l Union*, 863 S.W.2d at 461 (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes).

You contend the request encompasses the district attorney's office's entire prosecution file for the pending case at issue. In addition, you inform us the information at issue was compiled by the district attorney's office in preparation for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Based on the your representations and our review, we agree the district attorney's

³We note, however, that the court in *National Union* also concluded that a specific document is not automatically considered to be privileged simply because it is part of an attorney's file. 863 S.W.2d at 461. The court held that an opposing party may request specific documents or categories of documents that are relevant to the case without implicating the attorney work product privilege. *Id.*; Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996).

office may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁴

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. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential, such as section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *Id.* § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). However, section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, “[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]” *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). We have marked fingerprints in the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, section 560.002 permits disclosure of the fingerprint information. Therefore, the district attorney’s office must withhold the fingerprints we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a)(1). Upon review, we find the district attorney’s office must withhold the driver’s license information we have marked in the court-filed document under section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.136 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, the district attorney’s office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁶

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

⁵We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

⁶We note section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

In summary, the district attorney's office may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold (1) the fingerprints we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code; (2) the driver's license information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (3) the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must release the remaining information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/akg

Ref: ID# 516540

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)