ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 1, 2008

Mr. Christopher M. Jones
Senior Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2008-04255

Dear Mr. Jones:

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# 306627.

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for a specified letter and investigation pertaining to a named educator. You claim that the submitted information is privileged under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.[1] We have considered the privilege you claim and reviewed the submitted information.[2]

Initially, we note that you have not submitted the requested letter for our review. To the extent this information existed on the date the agency received this request, we assume you have released it to the requestor. If you have not released any such information, you must release it at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

---

[1]We note that although you also claim rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, you make no arguments to support this privilege. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this privilege applies to the submitted information.

[2]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.

In this instance, the submitted information consists of a completed investigation maintained by the agency on behalf of the State Board of Educator Certification (the "board"), which is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.[3] This section provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless the information is expressly confidential under "other law" or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For the purposes 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. 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

[3]The requested records are held by the agency because, effective September 1, 2005, all administrative functions, staff, and resources of the board were transferred to the agency.

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).

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file and the governmental body seeks to withhold the entire file, the governmental body may assert that the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the core work product aspect of the privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume that the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (*citing Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993)) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes); *see also Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 380 (Tex. 1994) (holding that "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case").

In this instance, you state that the requestor seeks the entire investigation file maintained by the agency pertaining to the named educator. You inform us that the agency 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. Code §§ 21.031(a), 21.041(b)(8). You further explain that the agency 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 id.* § 21.047(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.46 *et seq*. You represent to this office that the submitted information encompasses the board's entire litigation file with regard to its investigation of the named educator at issue. 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). You also inform us that the board's file containing information compiled during its investigation comprises its litigation file. Based on your representation that the submitted information encompasses the board's litigation file and that this information was prepared in anticipation of litigation, we conclude that the agency may withhold the submitted information as attorney work product under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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 file suit in

Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 306627

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Debra D. Tate
Assistant Director of Human Resources
Del Valle Independent School District
5301 Ross Road
Del Valle, Texas 78617
(w/o enclosures)