



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 11, 2015

Mr. Renato Garcia
Assistant City Attorney
Legal Department
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9016

OR2015-09061

Dear Mr. Garcia:

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# 563239 (City File No. 170).

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for all invoices received from or paid to law firms retained by the city to represent the city or its employees in specified matters during a certain time period, and all settlement agreements, including monetary payments to claimants, pertaining to the same specified matters. You state the city has provided some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered the privileges you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge 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:

...

(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 submitted information consists of attorney fee bills subject to section 552.022(a)(16). The city must release this information unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You assert Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 apply to the portions of the attorney fee bills you have marked. The Texas Supreme Court has held 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). Accordingly, we will consider your arguments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information you have marked.

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 to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; 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 to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, 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. *See Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002)*. 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 [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the submitted attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between attorneys for the city and city employees. You also state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you state the fee bills have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has established most of the information you have marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under Rule 503. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you marked consists of privileged attorney client communications. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an email was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue was communicated and it does not reveal a client confidence. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under Rule 503.

You claim Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information at issue. For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under Rule 192.5 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 that 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 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 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, orig. proceeding).


You assert the remaining information at issue consists of core work product protected by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Consequently, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue, which we have marked for release, under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city 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,



Leah B. Wingerson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/bhf

Ref: ID# 563239

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)