



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 7, 2012

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
The University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2012-06693

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 453352 (OGC# 142148).

The University of Texas at Austin (the “university”) received a request for full disclosure of all records related to the requestor, including all documents in the possession of a named university attorney containing the requestor’s name.¹ You state the university will redact information related to students other than the requestor pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g.² You state the university will release some of the requested information. You claim the remaining requested information

¹You state the university sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if a 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); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²The 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 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>.

is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing interested party may submit written comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note one of the submitted documents is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted court-filed document is subject to section 552.022(a)(17) and excepted from disclosure only if it is confidential under the Act or other law. Although you seek to withhold this document under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions that protect a governmental body's interests and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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 under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n. 5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the university may not withhold the court-filed document under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are other laws within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address the applicability of rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure to the court-filed document. We will also consider your arguments under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Rule 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For the 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

³We 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.

privilege. ORD No. 677 at 9-10. 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. 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 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 that 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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. 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 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).

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. ORD No. 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created for trial or 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").

The university states the information consists of the university's entire litigation file relating to the requestor's dismissal from a graduate degree program, prepared for anticipated litigation. Based on the university's representations and our review, we agree the present request encompasses the university's entire litigation file, and the university created the file in anticipation of or for litigation. Accordingly, we conclude the university may withhold

the information subject to section 552.022 as core work product under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.⁴

Next, we address the remaining information in the university's litigation file that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.111, which excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency," encompasses the attorney work product privilege in rule 192.5. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD No. 677 at 4-8. Section 552.111 protects work product as defined in rule 192.5(a) as:

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under the work product aspect of section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. The test to determine whether information was created or developed in anticipation of litigation is the same as that discussed above concerning rule 192.5. Again, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file and a governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume the entire file is protected from disclosure as attorney work product. ORD No. 647 at 5 (1996) (citing *Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes).

As noted above, the university represents the request encompasses its entire litigation file. Furthermore, the university demonstrated it created the file in anticipation of or for litigation. Based on the university's representations and our review, we conclude the university may withhold the remaining information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁵

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.

⁴As our ruling with regard to this information is dispositive, we do not address your remaining argument against its disclosure under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jessica Marsh".

Jessica Marsh
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JM/em

Ref: ID# 453352

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)