



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 10, 2005

Mr. Jim Thompson
General Counsel
State Board of Educator Certification
1701 North Congress Avenue, 5th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2005-09154

Dear Mr. Thompson:

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# 233959.

The State Board of Educator Certification (the "board") received a request for information relating to the investigation of a named individual. You state that you have released some of the requested information, but you claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, 552.114, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information consists of student records for which the board raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"). The board currently has a lawsuit pending against the Office of the Attorney General over the release of similar types of information, *State Board for Educator Certification v. Abbott*, Cause No. GV502481, 53rd District Court of Travis

¹ We assume that 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.

County, Texas. The board's arguments in the instant request for a decision are similar to the board's arguments in the pending litigation. Accordingly, we are closing our file with regard to the student records for which the board raises FERPA without issuing a decision and will allow the trial court to determine whether the information at issue must be released to the public.

We now address your claim that section 552.111 applies to one of the remaining submitted documents. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an 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 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 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 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.

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 § 21.041(b)(7). You

state that the document you have marked was created by board attorneys in anticipation of litigation. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constitutes litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor section 552.103). Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we find that you have demonstrated that the document you have marked was prepared in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, you may withhold this document under section 552.111 of the Government Code as attorney work product.²

In summary, we are closing our file with regard to the student records for which the board raises FERPA without issuing a decision and will allow the trial court to determine whether this information must be released to the public. The board may withhold the document you have marked as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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).

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 233959

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kathy Trempe
Ontario College of Teachers
121 Bloor Street East
Toronto, Ontario M4W3M5
(w/o enclosures)