



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 12, 2008

Mr. Christopher B. Gilbert
Bracewell & Giuliani, LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002-2770

OR2008-08049

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

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# 312524.

The Humble Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) all personal notes, interviews, and e-mails pertaining to three named individuals by any district employee, including contractors and attorneys; (2) a specified signature page; and (3) a full list of the types and locations of records pertaining to the three named individuals. You state that you have released or will release some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.² We have also considered

¹You also claim that a portion of this information is protected under the attorney-client privilege based on Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and under the attorney work product privilege based on Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. In this instance, however, because the information at issue is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the information is properly addressed here under section 552.107, rather than rule 503, and section 552.111, rather than rule 192.5. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 3 (2002); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022 (listing categories of information that are expressly public under the Act and must be released unless confidential under "other law"). As such, we address your arguments related to the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 and the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111.

²This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling neither reaches nor authorizes the district to withhold any information that is substantially different from the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, you inform us that some of the submitted information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-04879 (2008). With regard to information in the current request that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, the district must continue to rely on the ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release this information in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2008-04879. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

Next, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, 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 purposes of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.³ 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 "personally identifiable information"). You have submitted for our review redacted and unredacted education records. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue, other than to note that parents have a right of access to their own child's education records and that their right of access prevails over a claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴ *See* 20 U.S.C § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education record. The DOE also has informed this office, however, that a parent's right of access under FERPA to information about that parent's child does not prevail over

³A 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>.

⁴In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records, and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

an educational institution's right to assert the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges.⁵ Therefore, to the extent that the requestor has a right of access under FERPA to any of the information for which you claim the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges, we will address your assertion of these privileges under sections 552.107 and 552.111. We also will address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access under FERPA.

We next note that the information submitted in Exhibit D contains an order issued by a special education hearing officer. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

...

(12) final opinions, including concurring and dissenting opinions, and orders issued in the adjudication of cases[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(12). Section 552.022(a) makes these types of information expressly public unless they contain information that is expressly confidential under other law. Although you assert that the document that we have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this exception is a discretionary exception that protects a governmental body's interests and is therefore not "other law" for purposes of section 552.022(a)(12). 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. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Therefore, the marked document may not be withheld under section 552.103 and must be released pursuant to section 552.022.

We now turn to your arguments for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. You claim that information in Exhibits F and G is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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. 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

⁵Ordinarily, FERPA prevails over an inconsistent provision of state law. See *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F.Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995); ORD 431 at 3.

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). 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. *In re Tex. 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. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). 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 that the information at issue consists of communications between the district’s legal counsel and district representatives, made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You also inform us that the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your arguments and our review of this information, we conclude that the information in Exhibits F and G consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the district may withhold under section 552.107.⁶

The district argues the information in Exhibits H and I may be withheld under the work product privilege. Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the attorney work product privilege found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining claim for this information.

Procedure. See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; *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 attorney work product as consisting of:

- (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 governmental body that seeks to withhold information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. See *id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that information was created 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.

Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that the information at issue constitutes attorney work product created by the district's representatives in anticipation of litigation. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information in Exhibits H and I as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁷

Lastly we address section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining claim against disclosure of this information.

(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 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 that 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).

The district asserts that the remaining submitted information is excepted under section 552.103. You state, and provide documentation showing, that Civil Action No. H-07-2018 is pending before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. You explain that Docket No. 279-SE-0806 represents a special education due process hearing that is currently pending at the administrative level. We understand that this type of hearing is subject to the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. *See* 19 T.A.C. § 89.1180(f) (discovery methods for these disputes shall be limited to those specified in the APA); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991) (ruling that, for purposes of the Act, litigation includes a contested case under the predecessor to the APA). The submitted documentation reflects that each of these cases were pending on the date the district received the current request. Further, you contend, and we find, that the remaining information in Exhibits C, D, and E relates to the pending litigation. Therefore, we determine that section 552.103 is generally applicable in this instance.

We note, however, that the opposing parties have previously had access to some of the information in question. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that is related to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. If the opposing parties have

seen or had access to information that is related to pending litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. Thus, to the extent that the opposing parties have already seen or had access to the information at issue, the district may not now withhold any such information under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). With that exception, the district may withhold the information in Exhibits C, D, and E, under section 552.103. We note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2008-04879 with regard to the requested information that is the subject of that decision. The district must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022 of the Government Code. The district may withhold Exhibits F and G under section 552.107 and Exhibits H and I under section 552.111. Except for the information that the opposing parties in the pending litigation have seen, the district may withhold Exhibits C, D, and E under section 552.103 of the Government Code. This ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the district determine that all or portions of the submitted information consist of "education records" subject to FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline,

toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can challenge that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 312524

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cheryl Burbano
8103 Hurst Forest
Humble, Texas 77346-4511
(w/o enclosures)