



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 18, 2007

Mr. Phillip A. McKinney  
Attorney for Coastal Bend College  
P.A. McKinney & Associates  
P.O. Box 2747  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

OR2007-04354

Dear Mr. McKinney:

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# 275927.

Coastal Bend College (the "college"), which you represent, received a request for various categories of information, including: information pertaining to the requestor's grievance, communications regarding the requestor, college policies, criminal records, and information pertaining to a college employee's demotion. You state that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You also state that you have no responsive information pertaining to one of the categories of requested information.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

Initially, you inform this office that the college sought clarification from the requestor regarding the time period encompassed by the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used). We note that a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate a request for information to information that the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this case, as you have submitted responsive information for our review and raised exceptions to disclosure for these documents, we consider the college to have made a good faith effort to identify information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the applicability of the exceptions you claim to the requested information.

Next, we note that some of the submitted documents are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Attachments 3, 4, and 5 consist of completed investigations made for the college that are expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1) unless excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or confidential under other law. Section 552.108 is not claimed in this instance. Instead, the college asserts that this information is excepted under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions and, as such, are not other law for purposes of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived). Therefore, the college may not withhold Attachments 3, 4, and 5 pursuant to sections 552.103 or 552.111.

The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that 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). The attorney work product privilege also is found at Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, we will

consider your assertion of this privilege under rule 192.5 with respect to the information in the completed investigations.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For the purpose of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent that 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 that 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 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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's 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 that 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, no writ). However, upon reviewing your arguments and the information at issue, we find that you have failed to establish that any of it consists of core work product. Therefore, none of this information may be withheld under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. Criminal history record information ("CHRI") obtained from the National Crime Information Center or the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions,

indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions.”<sup>3</sup> Gov’t Code § 411.082(2). Federal law governs the dissemination of CHRI obtained from the National Crime Information Center network. Federal regulations prohibit the release to the general public of CHRI maintained in state and local CHRI systems. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) (“Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given”) and (c)(2) (“No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself”). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its own individual law with respect to CHRI that it generates. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 10-12 (1990); *see generally* Gov’t Code ch. 411 subch. F. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.089(b). We agree that the college must withhold Attachment 12 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code.

You claim that portions of the remaining submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Section 552.102 is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee’s employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person’s employment relationship and is part of employee’s personnel file). The privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.) (addressing statutory predecessor). We will therefore consider the applicability of common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claim regarding section 552.102.

In *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of a legitimate concern to the public. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Industrial Foundation*, 540 S.W.2d at 681-82. We have reviewed the remaining submitted documents and find that the information at issue is either not intimate or embarrassing or is of a legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the submitted

---

<sup>3</sup>We note that the statutory definition of CHRI does not encompass driving record information maintained by the Texas Department of Public Safety under subchapter C of chapter 521 of the Transportation Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.082(2).

information is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

We note that portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, which provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under section 552.137. Likewise, this section is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. Therefore, the college must withhold any personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the owner of a particular e-mail address has

affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. However, to the extent that any of the personal e-mail addresses belong to employees of entities with which the college has contractual relationships, or fall under any of the other exceptions listed under subsection 552.137(c), the e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137.

In summary, the college must withhold Attachment 12 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law and subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. The college must also withhold any personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the college received consent for their release or the e-mail addresses fall under any one of the exceptions listed under subsection 552.137(c). 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).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JLF', written in a cursive style.

Jaime L. Flores  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLF/jb

Ref: ID# 275927

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Donnie Contreras  
2037 County Road 308  
Beeville, Texas 78102  
(w/o enclosures)