



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 28, 2005

Mr. M. Gustave Pick
Scott, Hulse, Marshall, Feuille, Finger, & Thurmond, P.C.
P.O. Box 99123
El Paso, Texas 79999-9123

OR2005-06800

Dear Mr. Pick:

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# 229086.

The Ysleta Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the requestor's employment reassignment. You state you have released some information but claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.117 of the Government Code, as well as the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Upon review, we find that the submitted information constitutes two completed investigations relating to the requestor's reassignment. You state the investigation contained in documents YISD 000053 to YISD 000061 was prepared by the district's director of employee relations, with the assistance of the district's attorney, for the district's superintendent (the "superintendent's investigation"). You state that the

investigation contained in documents YISD 000062 to YISD 000122 was prepared by a district employee for the district's attorney (the "attorney's investigation"). We note that documents YISD 000123 to YISD 000223 are the exhibits to the attorney's investigation. Pursuant to section 522.022, the district must release these investigations unless they are confidential under other law.

Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (section 552.103 may be waived); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney work-product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 subject to waiver), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. However, sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 constitute other law for purposes of section 552.022. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and the Texas Rules of Evidence are also "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your arguments under these provisions.

You claim both submitted investigations are confidential under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Information generally deemed public under section 552.022 may be 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, no writ).

In this instance, you argue that “there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue” at the time the investigations were conducted. You assert that these investigations could have resulted in discipline of the requestor up to and including termination. You state that the requestor would have a right to an administrative hearing if actually terminated. However, you have not demonstrated that the district could reasonably have anticipated that litigation would ensue following any discipline, including a negative personnel action, of the requestor. Thus, none of the submitted information is protected by rule 192.5.

You argue a portion of the investigations are excepted as attorney-client communications under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Rule 503 provides in relevant part:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

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

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

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; 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 in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission

of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5). Thus, 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. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under Rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

As previously noted, you state the superintendent's investigation was prepared with the assistance of the district's attorney and the attorney's investigation was prepared by a district employee for the district's attorney. You further indicate that these investigations were intended to be confidential and that their confidentiality has been maintained. In support of your arguments, you have submitted an affidavit of the district's director of employee relations which attests that both investigations were directed by the district's attorney on behalf, and at the direction, of the district for the purpose of rendering legal services to the district. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the submitted investigations are protected by the attorney-client privilege. *See also Harlandale Independent School District*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding that attorney's entire investigative report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Therefore, the district may withhold documents YISD 000053 to YISD 000122 pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, you do not claim that documents YISD 000123 to YISD 000223 are protected by rule 503. We will therefore address your remaining claimed exceptions for those documents.

We next address your claim that the remaining documents are excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Act. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Accordingly, we will consider your privacy claims under section 552.101 and section 552.102(a) together.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. In order for information to be protected from public disclosure by the doctrine of common-law privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation*. In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. You assert that release of the personnel information at issue is an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. However, this information relates to district employees and there is a legitimate public interest in the qualifications of a public employee and how that employee performs job functions and satisfies employment conditions. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job performance of public employees), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Therefore, the district may not withhold all the personnel information at issue from public disclosure based on the common-law right to privacy.

However, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), and personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (public employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee’s decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, are protected under common-law privacy), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history protected under common-law privacy), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Accordingly, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.¹

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (“FERPA”) provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information, other than directory information, contained in a student’s education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student’s parent. *See* 20 U.S.C.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive of the information for which you argue the doctrine of constitutional privacy applies, we do not address that arguments.

§ 1232g(b)(1). "Education records" means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A); *see* Gov't Code § 552.026 (incorporating provisions of FERPA into the Act).

Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student." *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). Such information includes information that directly identifies a student as well as information that, if released, would allow the student's identity to be easily traced. *See* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979). Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student" or "one or both parents of such a student." *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). We have marked the student-identifying information in documents YISD 000123 to YISD 000223 that is subject to FERPA and must withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

The remaining documents also include medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002. The medical records must be released upon the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have marked the submitted medical records subject to the MPA.

You claim section 552.117 of the Government Code may also be applicable to some of the remaining information. Section 552.117 excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be

kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the district must withhold the employees' home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and any information that reveals whether these employees have family members. The school district may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

However, regardless of the applicability of section 552.117, the social security numbers in the information at issue must be withheld under section 552.147 of the Government Code.² Section 552.147³ provides that "[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from" required public disclosure under the Act. Therefore, the marked social security numbers must be withheld.⁴

In summary, the district may withhold YISD 000053 to YISD 000122 pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have marked the information in documents YISD 000123 to YISD 000223 that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the applicable employees timely elected to keep their section 552.117 information confidential, that marked information must be withheld. However, if the employees did not elect under section 552.024, you must withhold their social security numbers under section 552.147. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³ Added by Act of May 23, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1485, § 1, sec. 552.147(a) (to be codified at Tex. Gov't Code § 552.147).

⁴ We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/jev

Ref: ID# 229086

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Maria Greenup
1420 Beethoven
El Paso, Texas 79936
(w/o enclosures)