



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

May 24, 2011

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

OR2011-07313

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# 418519 (TEA PIR# 14966).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for copies of all documents related to the Texas state teacher certification of a named educator. You state some of the requested information will be released. You have withheld a Texas driver's license under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You have also withheld the educator's social security number under section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which is a representative sample.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including a copy of a Texas driver's license under section 552.130, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>2</sup>Section 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 an attorney general decision under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

<sup>3</sup>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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

You state a portion of submitted information is a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. This section provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless the information is expressly confidential under "other law" or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The Texas Supreme Court has held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the portion of the submitted information you marked under this rule.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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 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 and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. *See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1)*. A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

Additionally, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file the governmental body may assert that the file is excepted from disclosure 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 that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume that the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. See 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 that "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, and rules adopted by the agency under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code. See *id.* § 21.041(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 of the educator. You explain the file was created by attorneys, staff, and other representatives of the agency in anticipation of litigation. 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 and our review, we conclude the agency may withhold as attorney core work product the information you marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

~~Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."~~ Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 21.048 of the Education Code, which addresses teacher certification examinations. Section 21.048(c-1) provides the following:

(c-1) The results of an examination administered under this section are confidential and are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless:

(1) the disclosure is regarding notification to a parent of the assignment of an uncertified teacher to a classroom as required by Section 21.057; or

(2) the educator has failed the examination more than five times.

Educ. Code § 21.048(c-1). You have marked portions of the remaining information which you state reflect the results of examinations administered under section 21.048. You further state subsections 21.048(c-1)(1) and (2) are not applicable in this instance. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the agency must withhold the information you

marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code.

You raise section 552.102 of the Government Code and section 552.101 in conjunction with the ruling in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010), for the birth date you marked in the remaining information. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). You assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which also encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Under section 552.101, information is private if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be met. *Id.* at 681-82. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court recently expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller*, 2010 WL 4910163, at \*5. The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, not *Industrial Foundation*, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Id.* at \*10. Thus, *Texas Comptroller* applies only to a public employee’s birth date maintained by the employer in an employment context. In this instance, you state the educator is not an agency employee and her date of birth was not obtained from her personnel file. Therefore, we conclude the agency may not withhold the birth date you marked under sections 552.101 and 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, the agency may withhold the information you marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The agency must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code. The remaining information must be released.

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](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,



Kenneth Leland Conyer  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLC/eb

Ref: ID# 418519

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)