



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 16, 2014

Mr. Chris Sterner
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2014-16340

Dear Mr. Sterner:

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# 534969 (OOG ID# 177-14).

The Office of the Governor (the "governor's office") received a request for attorney fee bills related to the Governor's legal representation during a specified grand jury hearing, as well as the total amounts billed and paid to date. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. Outside counsel for the governor's office also argues the requested information is privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note the information contained in Exhibit B 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:

...

(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)(16). The information in Exhibit B consists of attorney fee bills subject to section 552.022(a)(16). Thus, the information in Exhibit B must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, this section is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions).* Therefore, the information in Exhibit B may not be withheld under this exception. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, the Texas Rules of Evidence and the 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). Accordingly, we will address your attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege claim under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Furthermore, as section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason against disclosure, we will address its applicability to the information at issue.

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 section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as article 20.02 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides "[t]he proceedings of the grand jury shall be secret." Crim. Proc. Code art. 20.02(a). In construing article 20.02 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the types of "proceedings" Texas courts have generally stated are secret are testimony presented to the grand jury and the deliberations of the grand jury. *See In re Reed*, 227 S.W.3d 273, 276 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2007, orig. proceeding). Upon review, we find you have not explained how any of the information at issue reveals grand jury testimony or deliberations of the grand jury. Therefore, we conclude the governor's office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with article 20.02(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 4 (1988) (fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is confidential in possession of district attorney).

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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 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).

You state the attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between the governor's office and counsel for the governor's office. You state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the governor's office. Further, you state these communications have remained confidential. Accordingly, the governor's office may withhold the information we have marked on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, the remaining information does not document a communication or consists of communications with parties whom you have not established are privileged parties for purposes of Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information may be withheld under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. 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 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 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the documents at issue contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test may be withheld 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 Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

Outside counsel for the governor's office contends the information constitutes attorney work product. Upon review, we find it has not been demonstrated any of the remaining information consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of trial. Therefore, the governor's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

In summary, the governor's office may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The governor's office must release the remaining information.

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,



Rustam Abedinzadeh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RA/dls

Ref: ID# 534969

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David L. Botsford
Botsford & Roark
1307 West Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)