KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2015

Mr. Mark Anthony Sanchez, Esq.
Counsel for the Bexar County Emergency Services District #2
Sanchez & Wilson, PLLC
115 East Travis, 19th Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2015-20965

Dear Mr. Sanchez:

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# 582291 (G, W & S File No. 5907).

The Bexar County Emergency Services District #2 (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for total compensation paid out during a specified period of time to three named individuals. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Procedure 192.5.[1] We have considered submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the district has only submitted information relating to one of the named individuals. We assume, to the extent any information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the district received the request, the district has released it. If the district has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if

[1]Although the district raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) 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 confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 522.022(a)(16). Although the district seeks to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.108. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the district's assertion of the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, respectively.

Texas Rule of Evidence 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 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).

The district contends the attorney-client privilege is applicable to the entirety of the information in the submitted attorney fee bills. We note section 552.022(a)(16) provides information "that is *in* a bill for attorney's fees" is not excepted from disclosure unless the information is confidential under the Act or other law or protected by the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). Thus, by its express language, section 552.022(a)(16) does not permit an attorney fee bill to be withheld in its entirety. *See also* Open Records Decisions Nos. 676 (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in its 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 is excepted only to extent it reveals client confidences or attorney's legal advice). Accordingly, we will determine whether the district may withhold the information within the fee bills under rule 503. We understand the attorney fee bills document communications between district employees and an attorney for the district that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. The district does not indicate it has waived the attorney-client privilege with regard to the communications. Upon review, we find the district may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.[2] However, we find the district has not demonstrated the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an e-mail was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Thus, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue was communicated and it does not

[2]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

reveal a client confidence. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information on that basis.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 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* 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 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 there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance 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. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 426 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

The district argues the remaining information consists of privileged attorney work product. Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the 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. Therefore, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The district 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,

David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 582291

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)