



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 7, 2016

Mr. Derrell A. Coleman
Counsel for the Nacogdoches Independent School District
Walsh, Gallegos, Treviño, Russo & Kyle, P.C.
P.O. Box 168046
Irving, Texas 75016

OR2016-24800

Dear Mr. Coleman:

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# 633430.

The Nacogdoches Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for legal invoices during a specified period of time pertaining to a named individual. You state you have redacted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You also state you will withhold information subject to section 552.117 of the Government

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student 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. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.² You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code as well as privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.³ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

You state the district sought clarification for the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). You further state the district has not received a response to the request for clarification. Thus, for the requested information for which the district has sought but has not received clarification, we find the district is not required to release information in response to the portion of the request at issue. However, if the requestor clarifies the portion of the request for information at issue, the district must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this case, as the district has submitted information responsive to the request and has made arguments against disclosure of this information, we will address the applicability of its arguments to the submitted information.

Next, you acknowledge, and we agree, the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege," unless the information is confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Although the district raises sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these exceptions are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8-10 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (governmental

²Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c).

³Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for the submitted information, you provide no arguments explaining how this exception is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

body may waive attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1)), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.107 or section 552.111. You also raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the submitted attorney fee bills. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and your assertion of the attorney work-product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the submitted attorney fee bills. Furthermore, as section 552.136 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will also consider the applicability of this exception for the information at issue.⁴

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client’s representative and the client’s lawyer or the lawyer’s representative;

(B) between the client’s lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;

(C) by the client, the client’s representative, the client’s lawyer, or the lawyer’s representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer’s representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client’s representatives or between the client and the client’s representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if it is 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).

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). Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You assert portions of the submitted fee bills reflect privileged attorney-client communications between the district’s attorneys, district employees or officials, and privileged third parties. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. You inform us the communications at issue were not disclosed to non-privileged parties, and confidentiality has not been waived. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have established most of the information you have marked constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the district may withhold the information you have marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.⁵ However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue documents attorney-client communications for purposes of rule 503. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue, which we have marked for release, may not be withheld on that basis.

We next address Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remaining information you marked in the submitted attorney fee bills. Rule 192.5 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

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 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 there was a substantial chance 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 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 the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You claim some of the remaining information you have marked consists of attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of trial. Thus, the district may not withhold the information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, the district must withhold the bank account and routing numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, except for the information we marked for release, the district may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district must withhold the bank account and routing numbers in the remaining information

under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/som

Ref: ID# 633430

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)