



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 13, 2010

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

OR2010-15605

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# 396608 (Agency PIR# 13613).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for six categories of information pertaining to: (1) a named superintendent, (2) a named former educator of the Mount Enterprise Independent School District (the "district"), and (3) a specified audit. You state the agency does not have information responsive to two of the categories of requested information.¹ You inform us the agency will release most of the remaining requested information. You state the agency has redacted social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.² You also state the agency has redacted a Texas driver's license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code pursuant to Open

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

²Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code 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. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Records Decision No. 684 (2009).³ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which are representative samples.⁴

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(b). However, this section further provides that “the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee” is not excepted from disclosure. *Id.* You state the submitted transcript is maintained in the former educator’s personnel files at the district, and you state the agency has possession of this transcript via a special right of access in chapter 249 of title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code. *See* 19 T.A.C. § 249.14 (agency may obtain and investigate information concerning alleged improper conduct by an educator). In *Texas Education Agency v. Greg Abbott* the district court held that transcripts obtained by the agency from a school district during their investigation of an educator are considered to be maintained in the personnel files of employees of the district and are thus subject to section 552.102(b). *Tex. Educ. Agency v. Greg Abbott, Att’y Gen. For the State of Tex.*, No. 07-002656 (250th Dist. Ct., Tex. Dec. 1, 2008). Thus, with the exception of the former educator’s name, courses taken, and degree obtained, the agency must withhold the submitted transcript pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.

Next, you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for some of 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

³We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including a Texas driver’s license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

⁴We assume 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 to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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). The agency 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 of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *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 agency 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 "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 in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, 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 ORD 452 at 4.

You inform us a portion of the remaining information relates to an open investigation of allegations that the former educator engaged in inappropriate conduct. You state the alleged misconduct may require the agency to file a petition for sanctions against the former educator pursuant to provisions of the Education Code and title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code. See Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a) (the agency shall regulate and oversee standards of conduct of public school educators), 21.041(b) (the agency shall propose rules providing for disciplinary proceedings); 19 T.A.C. §§ 247.2, 249.15(c). You explain that if the former educator files an answer to the petition, the matter will be referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings for a contested case proceeding. See *id.* § 249.18. You state such proceedings are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. See Educ. Code § 21.041(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.4(a)(1); 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 and our review, we determine the agency reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. Furthermore, you explain the information at issue was compiled for the purpose of investigating the alleged misconduct of the former educator. Upon review, we agree the information you have marked relates to the anticipated litigation. We therefore conclude the agency may withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

You raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.107(1) 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. See 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. See 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. See *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. See 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. See *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). 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 explain the information at issue constitutes confidential communications between attorneys for the agency and agency staff. You also assert the communications were made in confidence and in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services, and that the

communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Accordingly, we conclude the agency may withhold this information pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the former educator's name, courses taken, and degree obtained, the agency must withhold the submitted transcript pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. The agency may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The agency may withhold the remaining information you have marked pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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,



Christina Alvarado
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CA/tp

Ref: ID# 396608

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)