



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 8, 2012

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

OR2012-03538

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# 447650 (TEA PIR# 16725).

The Texas Education Agency ("TEA") received a 10-part request for information related to a named educator, an investigation involving the educator, and related matters. You state TEA has no information responsive to parts of the request.¹ You also state information responsive to other parts of the request will be released. You inform us TEA has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² You claim the rest of the submitted information is privileged under rule 192.5

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²The 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 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 the DOE's letter to this office is posted on the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the information you submitted.³

As you acknowledge, the submitted information consists of a completed investigation conducted by TEA, so as to be subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body,” unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will address your claim for the submitted information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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 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 core attorney 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 or for trial, 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 or an attorney’s

³This letter ruling assumes the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling neither reaches nor authorizes TEA 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).

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).

If a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, and the governmental body seeks to withhold the entire file, the governmental body may assert that the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the core work product aspect of the attorney work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. In such an instance, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation or for trial, this office will presume 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 explain TEA "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 [c]hapter 21 of the Education Code." *See* Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a), .041. You state TEA litigates enforcement proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, and rules adopted by TEA 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 note the requestor seeks access to "[a]ll documents concerning any investigation of [a named educator]." You state the information responsive to the request consists of TEA's entire case file pertaining to an investigation of alleged educator misconduct. You explain the file was compiled in the course of conducting the investigation and created by attorneys, legal staff, and other representatives of TEA in anticipation of litigation. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constituted litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). Based on your representations, we conclude TEA may withhold the submitted information in its entirety as core attorney work product under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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.

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 black ink that reads "James W. Morris III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "J" and a stylized "III" at the end.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/em

Ref: ID# 447650

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)