



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 19, 2016

Ms. Patricia A. Rigney
City Attorney
City of Pharr
P.O. Box 1729
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2016-08721

Dear Ms. Rigney:

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# 606655 (ORR PIR-2016-040).

The City of Pharr (the "city") received a request for a specified agreement and correspondence related to specified utility programs since April 15, 2015. The city states it will provide some of the requested information to the requestor, but claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the request for information because it was created after the city received the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release this information in response to this request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002).

¹Although the city also raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990) (predecessor statute).

First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The city asserts the submitted responsive information consists of documents or confidential e-mail communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The city also asserts these communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. We note some of the information at issue consists of a communication with an individual whom the city has not identified or otherwise established is a privileged party. Thus, we conclude the city has failed to establish this information, which we have marked for release, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1). Nevertheless, we find the city has established the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Consequently, the city may generally withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note one of these e-mail strings includes an e-mail received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mail received from or sent to the non-privileged party is removed from the e-mail string and stands alone, it is responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the city maintains the non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then the city may not withhold this non-privileged e-mail under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. In that event, we

will address the city's arguments under section 552.111 of the Government Code for such information.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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 section 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); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). 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, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude 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 city asserts the remaining responsive information consists of privileged attorney work product. However, as discussed above, this information consists of a communication with an individual whom the city has not established is a privileged party. Therefore, because this party has had access to the information at issue, the city has waived the work product privilege under section 552.111 for it. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining responsive information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

To conclude, the city must provide to the requestor the information we have marked for release. The city may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the city maintains the non-privileged e-mail we have marked separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then the city must release this information to the requestor.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 606655

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)