



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 15, 2012

Mr. Rusty Meurer
Kazen, Meurer & Pérez L.L.P
211 Calle Del Norte, Ste. 100
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2012-16436

Dear Mr. Meurer:

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# 467847.

The Laredo Community College (the "college"), which you represent, received a request for all documents pertaining to a specified case on the agenda for a specified meeting. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. You state you have notified certain interested parties of the request and of their rights to submit arguments as to why the submitted information should or should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a), 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.¹ Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See 34 C.F.R. § 99.3* (defining

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

“personally identifiable information”). Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 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). A governmental body 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 the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that 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). A governmental body 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* at 4. Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly

²In the future, if the college does obtain parental or an adult student’s consent to submit unredacted education records and the college seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

In this instance, you state prior to the college's receipt of the present request, the complainant at issue in the submitted information filed a grievance and hired an attorney to represent her at the grievance hearing. However, you have not demonstrated that, at the time of the request, the complainant at issue had taken concrete steps towards litigation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Furthermore, you have not explained how the grievance process is considered to be litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (discussing factors used by attorney general in determining whether administrative proceeding not subject to Administrative Procedure Act may be considered to be litigation); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the college reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, we conclude none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *Id.* 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.*, 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 state some of the submitted information consists of communications between the college's attorneys and college representatives made to facilitate the rendition of professional

legal services to the college. You inform us the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude you have established the communications at issue are protected by the attorney-client privilege. Thus, the college may generally withhold the information at issue under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of the e-mail strings include e-mails and attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails and attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we have marked, are maintained by the college separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the college may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The college may withhold the remaining information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) [M]aterial 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 this exception 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. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

- (a) 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 b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. 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; ORD 677 at 7.

You claim the remaining non-privileged communications we have marked disclose attorney work product. However, because this information was communicated with non-privileged parties, we find the college has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the work product privilege to it. Accordingly, the remaining non-privileged communications may not be withheld under the work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note a portion of the remaining information is subject to sections 552.101 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right to privacy, which protects information 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. Common-law privacy protects the types of information held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). Additionally, this office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the college must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1175 protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. *See* Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure." *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). We have marked information of a peace officer that is subject to section 552.1175. If the peace officer elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the college must withhold the marked information under section 552.1175.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the college may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we have marked, are maintained by the college separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the college may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The college must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the peace officer elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, the college must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.⁴

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,



Nneka Kanu
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NK/akg

Ref: ID# 467847

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note the information being released contains social security numbers. 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 a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Mr. Rusty Meurer - Page 7

**bcc: Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)**