



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

March 23, 2004

Ms. Lisa D. Patterson
Acting General Counsel
State Board for Educator Certification
4616 West Howard Lane, Suite 120
Austin, Texas 78728

OR2004-2160

Dear Ms. Patterson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 198002.

The State Board for Educator Certification (the "board") received a request for information relating to a complaint filed against a named principal of a school district. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. You also have notified the individual who is the subject of the complaint of this request for information and of her right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.¹ We also received arguments from the principal's attorney. We have considered all of the submitted arguments and have reviewed the information you submitted.²

¹See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances).

²This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative samples of information are truly representative of the responsive information as a whole. This ruling neither reaches nor authorizes the board to withhold any information that is substantially different from the submitted information. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D); Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This section encompasses the work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. *See 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 governmental body that seeks to withhold information as work product under section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. *See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5*; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that 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; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 7.

If a requestor seeks access to an entire litigation file, and a governmental body seeks to withhold the entire file and demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume that the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. *See Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (citing National Union Fire Insurance Co. v Valdez, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993)) (organization of attorney’s litigation file necessarily reflects attorney’s thought processes).*

In this instance, the requestor seeks access to “any and all documents relating to the complaint filed with [the board]” against a named principal of a particular school district. You inform us that the board enforces standards of conduct for certified educators in Texas public schools, including enforcement of an educator’s code of ethics, under chapter 21 of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Cod § 21.031(a), 21.041(b)(8). You further explain that the board litigates enforcement proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (the “APA”), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, and rules adopted by the board under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Code § 21.047(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.46 *et seq.* You represent to this office that the present request for information encompasses the board’s entire litigation file with regard to the complaint referenced by the requestor. You explain that the file was created by attorneys and other representatives of the board in anticipation of litigation. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constitutes litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.103). Based on your representation that this request for information encompasses the board’s entire case file and your demonstration that the submitted information was prepared in anticipation of litigation, we conclude that the board may withhold the submitted information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code. As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the other submitted arguments against disclosure.

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination with regard to the type of information that is the subject of this letter ruling. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). We decline to do so at this time. This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records


will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.W. Morris III", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 198002

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Tom Purcell
P.O. Box 2056
Roanoke, Texas 76262
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. Donald E. Lindsay
Richards Lindsay & Martin, L.L.P.
9801 Anderson Mill Road, Suite 230
Austin, Texas 78750
(w/o enclosures)