



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 16, 2005

Ms. Marquette Maresh
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
6300 La Calma, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2005-08468

Dear Ms. Maresh:

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# 232347.

The Bastrop Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request from the State Board for Educator Certification ("SBEC") for information concerning a former employee of the district. You state that the district has released some information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.107, 552.111 and 552.114 of the Government Code and protected under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we also note that the submitted documents that you have labeled Exhibit 4 include a public notice of a special meeting of the district board of trustees. The minutes, tape recordings, and agendas of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings of open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying upon request), 551.043 (notice of meeting of governmental body must be posted in a place readily accessible to general public at least 72 hours before scheduled time of meeting), 551.053-.054 (district governing bodies required to post notice of meeting at a place convenient to the public in administrative office of district); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(15) (information regarded as open to the public is not excepted from disclosure under Act unless expressly confidential by law). Information

made public by statute may not be withheld from the public under any of the Act's exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 544 (1990), 378 (1983), 161 (1977), 146 (1976). Accordingly, the district must release the public notice we have marked in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. *See* Gov't Code § 551.022.

Section 552.107(1) protects information that is encompassed by the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body maintains the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *See id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *See* 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. *See In re Texas 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 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. *See* 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, *see id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "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." *See 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. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). 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). Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information marked as Exhibits 3 and 4 constitute communications exchanged between privileged parties in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to the district. Accordingly,

we conclude that the district may withhold Exhibits 3 and 4 pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.¹

The district raises the work product exception for the remaining submitted information, which it has labeled as Exhibits 5, 6, and 7. Section 552.111 encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *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). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception 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. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; ORD 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; ORD 677 at 7.

The district asserts that it retained outside counsel "to provide professional legal services regarding allegations of misconduct by an employee with a student." The district argues that the "requested information [in Exhibits 5, 6, and 7] was prepared by the [d]istrict's attorneys and contains the attorneys' mental impressions, conclusions, opinions or legal theories" and

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments regarding this information.

thus constitutes “core work product” or “attorney work product.” The district further asserts that this information “was made and developed in anticipation of litigation.” Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the district may withhold Exhibits 5, 6, and 7 under section 552.111 of the Government Code as attorney work product.

In summary, with the exception of the marked public notice, which must be released, the district may withhold the information in Exhibits 3 and 4 pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code, and the information in Exhibits 5, 6, and 7 pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider the district’s remaining arguments against disclosure.

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, 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); *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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/sdk

Ref: ID# 232347

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Scott Byram
Staff Investigator
Professional Discipline Unit
State Board for Educator Certification
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)