ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 8, 2010

Mr. W. Mongomery Meitler
Assistant General Counsel
Office of Legal Services
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2009-00366

Dear Mr. Metiler:

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# 366674 (TEA PIR# 12035).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for information pertaining to the sanction of a named educator. You state the agency has redacted student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a).[1] You claim the requested information is privileged under rule 192.5 of the

[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 Genera's website: http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf.

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your argument and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[2]

Section 552.022(a) of the Government Code 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:
>
> > (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 submitted 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 submitted records are privileged under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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. 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

---

[2] We assume 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.

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, 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* Open Records Decision No. 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 responsive information encompasses the agency's entire litigation file with regard to its investigation of the educator named in the request. You explain the file was created by attorneys, legal staff, 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 section 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.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

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, 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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Kate Hartfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/eeg

Ref: ID# 366674

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)