



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 1, 2008

Ms. Lisa A. Brown
Bracewell & Giuliani, LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002-2770

OR2008-13488

Dear Ms. Brown:

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# 323422.

The Humble Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for multiple categories of information pertaining to the requestor's child. You state that you will make some responsive documents available to the requestor. 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 and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 and Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.² We have also received and

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Further, although you initially also raised Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct 1.05 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 193.3, you have not provided any arguments explaining how these rules apply to the requested information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn your arguments under Rule 1.05 and Rule 193.3. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²We assume that the representative samples of records submitted to this office are 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

considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments concerning availability of requested information).

Initially, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purposes of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.³ Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). You have submitted for our review redacted and unredacted education records within Tabs D and E. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue, other than to note that parents have a right of access to their own child's education records and that their right of access prevails over a claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴ *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education record. The DOE also has informed this office, however, that a parent's right of access under FERPA to information about that parent's child does not prevail over an educational institution's right to assert the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges.⁵ Therefore, to the extent that the requestor has a right of access under FERPA to any of the information for which you claim the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges, we will address your assertion of these privileges under sections 552.107 and 552.111.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107,

to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

³A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

⁴In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records, and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

⁵Ordinarily, FERPA prevails over an inconsistent provision of state law. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F.Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995); ORD 431 at 3.

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 Tex. 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)(A)–(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, *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.” *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 Tabs D and E consist of communications between the district’s legal counsel and district representatives, made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You also inform us that the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your arguments and our review of this information, we conclude that most of the documents within Tabs D and E constitute privileged attorney-client communications that the district may withhold under section 552.107. However, you have failed to demonstrate how the submitted handwritten notes constitute confidential communications between privileged parties. Accordingly, these notes may not be withheld under section 552.107.

You also assert that the handwritten notes are attorney-work product subject to section 552.111. 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 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 v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD 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.

See *Nat’l Tank*, 851 S.W.2d at 207. 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. In this instance, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the requestor has requested certain relief from the district and threatens to “pursue a breach of contract in the civil courts.” You explain that the handwritten notes within Tabs D and E were created by a district attorney in anticipation of this litigation. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that these notes constitute attorney work product created by the district’s representatives in

anticipation of litigation. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked in Tabs D and E under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We next note that Tab F contains court-filed documents, which we have marked. 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 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), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Furthermore, although Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, which protects information coming 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 would be waived to the extent the otherwise privileged information is contained in a court filed document. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 511. Accordingly, none of the court-filed documents may be withheld under Rule 503.

We will, however, address your argument against disclosure of the marked court-filed documents under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, which is "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d at 336. 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 No. 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). 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 an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *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*, 851 S.W.2d at 207. 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). In this instance, you state that the court-filed documents within Tab F were collected by district attorneys in anticipation of litigation with the requestor. However, upon review, we conclude that no portion of the court-filed documents at issue reflects the mental processes, conclusions, strategies, or legal theories of the district's attorneys regarding anticipated litigation. Thus, these documents are not protected by rule 192.5, and the district may not withhold them on that basis. As no other exceptions are raised, the marked court-filed documents must be released to the requestor.

We now turn to your arguments regarding the remaining information within Tab F. Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In the context of anticipated litigation by a governmental body, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is “realistically contemplated.” See Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld from disclosure if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is “reasonably likely to result”). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

In this instance, you inform this office that the remaining information at issue pertains to a dispute between the parent of a district student and the district. You state that, although this dispute has already been litigated, the district and the parent “continue to disagree about certain matters.” You inform this office that the parent threatened to bring civil litigation against the district for breach of contract before the present request for information was received. Based on your representations, we find that the district anticipated litigation when it received this request for information. Further, we also find that the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we find that the remaining information within Tab F be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁶

We note, however, that the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that is related to litigation through discovery procedures. See ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, if the opposing party has seen or had access to information that is related to the anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We further note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982), 349.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we marked within Tabs D and E under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked within Tab F under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or