



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 25, 2016

Mr. George H. Nelson
Chief Defender
Lubbock Private Defenders' Office
1504 Main Street
Lubbock, Texas 79401

OR2016-11994

Dear Mr. Nelson:

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# 611499.

The Lubbock Private Defenders' Office (the "private defenders' office") received a request for information detailing the private defenders' office's expenses for a specified year. You claim the submitted information is not subject to the Act, or in the alternative, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct 1.05. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

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

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

(a-1) Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a), (a-1). However, the Act's definition of "governmental body" does not include the judiciary. *Id.* § 552.003(1)(B). Information "collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the judiciary" is not subject to the Act but, instead, is "governed by rules adopted by the Supreme Court of Texas or by other applicable laws and rules." *Id.* § 552.0035; Tex. R. Jud. Admin. 12 (public access to judicial records). Consequently, records of the judiciary need not be released under the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-166 (1992).

The private defenders' office was appointed to operate Lubbock County's (the "county") Managed Assigned Counsel Program in accordance with article 26.047 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 26.047(a)(2) (defining "[m]anaged assigned counsel program" as program operated with public funds by nonprofit corporation for purpose of appointing counsel). You argue the information generated by and for the private defenders' office while acting as the courts' designee for the purpose of appointing qualified counsel to indigent defendants pursuant to article 26.04 of the Code of Criminal Procedure consists of records of the judiciary. However, we find the information at issue consists of invoices submitted to the county for payment of legal services and were created and maintained in the private defenders' office's own capacity in the course of the private defenders' office's official business. Consequently, we find the submitted information does not consist of records of the judiciary and is subject to the Act. Accordingly, we will address your arguments for withholding the requested information under the Act.

We note, and you acknowledge, some of 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 expressly confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16). We note the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct are not considered “other law” for purposes of section 552.022. Consequently, we do not address your argument under rule 1.05 and the private defenders’ office may not withhold any of the submitted information on this basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 3-4 (2002). However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has held 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 claims of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Furthermore, as section 552.101 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will also consider your argument under this exception for 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. The private defenders’ office raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for some of the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In Open Records Decision No. 681, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *Id.*; *see* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. Therefore, we held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006,

no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the private defenders' office may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 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* ORD 676. 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 fee bills contain communications that were intended to facilitate the rendition of legal services. You further state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the private defenders' office may withhold the information we marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.² However, we find the remaining information at issue either does not indicate it was communicated or consists of communications with parties whom you have not established are privileged parties for purposes of rule 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. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the private defenders' office may not withhold the remaining information at issue under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9–10 (2002). 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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You state the remaining information you have marked consists of communications and work performed by the private defenders' office in anticipation of litigation. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information at issue consists of an attorney's core work product. Accordingly, the private defenders' office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the private defenders' office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

However, the private defenders' office has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the private defenders' office may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the private defenders' office may withhold the information we marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The private defenders' office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The private defenders' 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 611499

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)