



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 14, 2013

Mr. Justin R. Graham
For the New Caney Independent School District
Henslee Schwartz, L.L.P.
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77027

OR2013-10062

Dear Mr. Graham:

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# 490165.

The New Caney Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any special education legal expenses incurred by the district pertaining to a specified case during a specified time period. You inform us you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code, and privileged under rules 408 and 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.¹ We have considered your submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although you also raise section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code, we note section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022. Additionally, although you also raised section 552.102 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how this exception applies to the submitted information. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn it. *See id.* §§ 552.301, .302. We understand you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. However, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office that the Family Educational 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 purpose 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”). In this instance, you have submitted redacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted documents, except to note that a parent has a right of access to their own child’s education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We will, however, address the applicability of the district’s claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Next, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills which 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 you seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure 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. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the district may not withhold the submitted information under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your arguments under rules 408 and 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Additionally, because sections 552.101 and 552.136 make information confidential under the Act, we will address the applicability of these sections to the submitted information.

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>.

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 for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

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

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).

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. 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, no writ).

You state the information you have marked in the submitted attorney fee-bills consists of communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You explain the communications were exchanged between employees of the district and attorneys for the district. You state the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Having considered your representations and

reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established some of the information you seek to withhold, which we have marked, constitutes privileged attorney-client communications the district may withhold under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.⁴ However, the remaining information at issue either does not reveal a communication, reveals a communication with a party who is not identified as privileged with respect to the communication, or reveals the creation of a document but does not reflect whether the document was communicated. Thus, you have not established any of the remaining information you have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 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* ORD 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. *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 assert the remaining information you have marked contains attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information in the submitted fee bills consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. We therefore conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining fee-bill information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Rule 408 of the Texas Rules of Evidence governs the admissibility of information developed through compromise negotiations. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 408. However, rule 408 does not expressly make information confidential. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (stating that statutory confidentiality provision must be express and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure), 478 at 2 (1987) (stating that, as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential), 465 at 4-5 (1987). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 408 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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 exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. Section 101.104 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code provides:

- (a) Neither the existence nor the amount of insurance held by a governmental unit is admissible in the trial of a suit under [the Texas Tort Claims Act].
- (b) Neither the existence nor the amount of the insurance is subject to discovery.

Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 101.104. Section 101.104 prohibits the discovery and admission of insurance information during a trial under the Texas Tort Claims Act, chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code. *See City of Bedford v. Schattman*, 776 S.W.2d 812, 813-14 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1989, orig. proceeding) (protection from producing evidence of insurance coverage under section 101.104 is limited to actions brought under Tort Claims Act). However, section 101.104 does not make insurance information confidential for purposes of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 3 (1990) (provisions of section 101.104 "are not relevant to the availability of the information to the public"). The Act differs in purpose from statutes and procedural rules providing for discovery in judicial proceedings. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.005 (Act does not affect scope of civil discovery), .006 (Act does not authorize withholding public information or limit availability of public information to public except as expressly provided by Act); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JM-1048 (1989); Open Records Decision No. 575 (1990) (*overruled in part by* Open Records Decision No. 647 (1996)) (section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges). Thus, we find section 101.104 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code does not make the information at issue confidential for purposes of section 552.101 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not

withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 101.104 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code.


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, we find the district must withhold the bank account and routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find none of the remaining information constitutes an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and must withhold the bank account and routing numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/dls

⁵Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

Ref: ID# 490165

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)