



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 8, 2008

Mr. Robert Viña, III
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
6521 North 10th Street, Suite C
McAllen, Texas 78504

OR2008-09226

Dear Mr. Viña:

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# 315065.

The Raymondville Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for eleven categories of information pertaining a named former district employee. You state that you have released some of the requested information. We note that you have redacted some of the responsive information pursuant to the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the information you have submitted.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information consists of minutes of an open meeting of the district's Board of Trustees. Section 551.022 of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code, expressly provides that the "minutes and tape recordings of an open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to the governmental body's chief administrative officer or the officer's designee." Gov't Code § 551.022. Information that is specifically made public by statute may not be withheld from the public under any of the exceptions to public disclosure

¹Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted information.

under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 544 (1990), 378 (1983), 161 (1977), 146 (1976). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted open meeting minutes, which we have marked, under the claimed exceptions and must release this information to the requestor.

Next, we note that the remaining information includes documents that have been filed with a court. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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:

...

(17) information that is also contained in the public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Section 552.022(a)(17) makes information filed with a court expressly public unless it contains information that is expressly confidential under other law. Although you assert that these documents, which we have marked, are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these exceptions are discretionary exceptions that protect a governmental body's interests and are therefore not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022(a)(17). *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. 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 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Thus, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 do not constitute other laws for the purpose of section 552.022(a)(17). Therefore, the city may not withhold the court-filed documents we have marked under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that makes information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Furthermore, although rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, which protects information within the attorney-client privilege, constitutes "other law" for purposes of section 552.022, *see In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001), the privilege is waived to the extent the otherwise privileged information is contained in a court-filed document. *See TEX. R. EVID. 511* (stating that a person waives a discovery privilege if he voluntarily discloses the privileged information).

The Texas Supreme Court also has held that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. ORD 677 at 9-10. 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). We conclude that the inclusion of information that is subject to rule 192.5 in a court-filed document waives the privilege under rule 192.5. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the court-filed documents under rule 192.5.

We now turn to the information that is not subject to section 552.022. We note that the remaining information contains the requestor's client's medical records. 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. Medical records are confidential under the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. See Occ. Code § 151.001. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(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.

Id. § 159.002(b)-(c). This office has determined that in governing access to a specific subset of information, the MPA prevails over the more general provisions of the Act. See Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We also have concluded that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all of the documents in the file that relate to diagnosis and treatment constitute either physician-patient communications or records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician. See Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Upon review, we have marked the records that are subject to the MPA. In this instance, the requestor is the attorney of the individual who is the subject of the medical records. Thus, he may have a right of access to the medical records. These medical records must be released to this requestor on receipt of a signed, written consent from the requestor's client, 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. See Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. See *id.* § 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). If this consent is not received, the medical records must be withheld from disclosure pursuant to the MPA and section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You claim section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.103 provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state that prior to the receipt of this request, a lawsuit was pending in the 197th Judicial District Court, Willacy County, Texas against the district. Based upon your representation and our review, we conclude that litigation was pending when the district received the request. You also state that the remaining information is related to the pending litigation because the plaintiff is seeking judicial review of the district's denial of the plaintiff's request for assault leave. Based on your representations, we conclude that the remaining information is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the district may generally withhold most of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note that once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). In this instance, we note that the opposing party has seen some of the information at issue. Thus, the information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). Accordingly,

the district may withhold the information that is not subject to section 552.022 and that the opposing party to the litigation has not seen or had access to under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We note that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW - 575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Next, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information that the opposing party to the litigation has seen or had access to. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *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. 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. *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 a 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. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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, *id.*, 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.” *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. *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).

You state that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107. We note, however, that the opposing party to the litigation has either created or had access to the remaining information. Therefore, we find that you have not demonstrated that the

remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the district may withhold under section 552.107.

Finally, you claim section 552.111 for the remaining information. Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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.” This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state that the remaining information “are the communications of the thoughts and recommendations of the [s]uperintendent, other [d]istrict personnel and [d]istrict counsel.” As noted above, the remaining information was either provided to or obtained from the opposing party to litigation. Thus, this information was shared with a party to whom the district does not share a privity of interest or common deliberative process. We therefore conclude that the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on the basis of the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; *City of Garland*, 22

S.W.3d at 360; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines attorney work product as consisting of

(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 governmental body that seeks to withhold information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 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. *See id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that information was created 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.

You also appear to claim the work product privilege under section 552.111 for the remaining information. As noted above, the remaining information consists of information that was provided by the opposing party to litigation or the opposing party has had access to the information. We conclude that because the opposing party to litigation has had access to the remaining information, the work product privilege under section 552.111 has been waived. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may only release the marked medical records in accordance with the MPA. The district may withhold the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022 and that the opposing party to the pending litigation has not seen or had

access to under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.²

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,

²We note, however, that the submitted documents contain information that is confidential with respect to the general public. See Gov't Code § 552.023 (person's authorized representative has special right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect person's privacy interest as subject of the information); see also Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when person asks governmental body for information concerning the person himself or herself). Thus, in the event the commission receives another request for this information from someone other than this requestor or his client, the district must ask this office for a decision whether the information is subject to public disclosure.

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,



Melanie J. Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/jh

Ref: ID# 315065

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Daniel Ortiz
Ortiz & Associates
1304 West Abram, Suite 100
Arlington, Texas 76013
(w/o enclosures)