



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 28, 2009

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Counsel  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Ave.  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2009-05593

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 341602 (TEA PIR # 10796).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for five categories of information related to a named educator. You inform us that you do not have any information responsive to the portion of the request seeking complaints against the named educator. You state that you have released some of the information to the requestor. You also state that you have redacted social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.022(a) of the Government Code provides, in part, that

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.147(b) authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

<sup>2</sup>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.

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, or, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). In this instance, you acknowledge the requested information consists of a completed investigation conducted by the agency. A completed investigation must be released under section 552.022(a)(1), unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under "other law." The Texas Supreme Court held "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, you assert the requested records are privileged under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. In addition, because section 552.130 is other law for the purposes of section 552.022, we will also consider your arguments under this section.

For purposes 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. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). 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 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 the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance 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 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).

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 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 the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume 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 "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").

You inform us the agency "regulates and oversees all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and enforcement of standards of conduct for certified educators in Texas public schools under the authority of Chapter 21 of the Education Code." See Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a), .041. You further explain the agency litigates enforcement proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. See *id.* § 21.047(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.3 et seq. You represent to this office that the requested information encompasses the agency's entire litigation file with regard to its investigation pertaining to the certification of the named educator. You explain the file was created by attorneys and other representatives of the agency in anticipation of litigation "because litigation is the ultimate resolution of all such investigations that are not settled or dismissed." Cf. Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constitutes litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). Based on your representations, we conclude the agency may withhold the submitted investigation records as attorney work-product under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.<sup>3</sup>

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the agency to withhold driver's license numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting a ruling from our office under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (previous determinations). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Rather, 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Tamara Wilcox  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TW/eeg

Ref: ID# 341602

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)