



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 3, 2008

Ms. Stephanie Rosenberg
General Counsel
Humble Independent School District
P.O. Box 2000
Humble, Texas 77347-2000

OR2008-14959

Dear Ms. Rosenberg:

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# 326772.

The Humble Independent School District (the "district") received two requests for billing statements, invoices, and receipts for all legal expenses received and/or paid during June and July 2008. You state that some of the submitted information has been redacted pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.² You claim that

¹ 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 purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

² Although you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with, among other things, Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 and Texas Rule of Evidence 503, 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).

the remaining information is privileged under Rules 408 and 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.³ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state that the district sought clarification from the requestor. *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). You inform us that the district has not received a response from the requestor. 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 district to have made a good faith effort to identify information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides in part that

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:

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). In this instance, the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills. Thus, the district must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(16) unless it is expressly confidential under other law. You claim that portions of the submitted attorney fee bills are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions under the Act and do not constitute "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. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege

³ You also raise Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 193.3. We note that this rule instructs a party on how to preserve a privilege from written discovery. In addition, while you also raise Rule 1.05 of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct, you have provided no argument explaining how this rule is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume you no longer assert this argument. Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 677 at 10 (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111.

The Texas Supreme Court has held 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). We will therefore consider your arguments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, as well as your arguments under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You claim that some of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 408. For information to be confidential under section 552.101, the provision of law must explicitly require confidentiality. A confidentiality requirement will not be inferred from a provision’s structure. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (stating that statutory confidentiality provision must be express and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 478 at 2 (1987) (stating that, as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential), 465 at 4-5 (1987).* Rule 408 of the Texas Rules of Evidence governs the admissibility of information developed through compromise negotiations. *See TEX. R. EVID. 408.* Because rule 408 does not explicitly provide that information is confidential, we find that the district may not withhold any information from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 408.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if 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). Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You indicate that the submitted attorney fee bills contain confidential communications between the district's attorneys and the district that were made for the purposes of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that a portion of the attorney fee bills contain information that reveals confidential communications between privileged parties. Accordingly, except for the information we have marked for release, the district may withhold the information you have marked in dark orange, as well as the additional information we have marked, under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We note, however, that you have failed to identify some of the parties to some of the communications or explain their relationship with the district. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 8 (governmental body must inform this office of identities and capacities of individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made; this office cannot necessarily assume that communication was made only among categories of individuals identified in rule 503). Accordingly, as you have failed to demonstrate how any of portion of the remaining information constitute attorney-client communications, we conclude that Texas Rule of Evidence 503 is not applicable to the remaining information at issue and it may not be withheld on this basis.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For 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 (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 when the governmental body received the request for information 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 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contains 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).

Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we conclude you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information consists of core work product for purposes of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under rule 192.5.

We note that the submitted information contains bank account and routing numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states in part that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."⁴ Gov't Code § 552.136. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

To conclude, except for the information we have marked for release, the district may withhold the information in the attorney fee bills that you have marked in dark orange, as well as the additional information we have marked, under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136. 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 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 'Chris Schulz', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/ma

Ref: ID# 326772

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David Lovelace
103 Galaxy
Austin, Texas 78734
(w/o enclosures)