



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 6, 2015

Mr. John J. Janssen  
General Counsel  
Corpus Christi Independent School District  
P.O. Box 110  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403-0110

OR2015-13561

Dear Mr. Janssen:

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# 570189.

The Corpus Christi Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the personnel file for the requestor's client, records related to a complaint, allegation of misconduct, or performance deficiency pertaining to the requestor's client during a specified period of time, and all correspondence between two named individuals and specified employees during a specified period of time. We understand you have withheld some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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 an adult student's 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 educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup>Although you raise sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.107 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support these exceptions. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claims these sections apply to the submitted information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

*Id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes completed evaluations that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed evaluations pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these exceptions are discretionary 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 at 8-10 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 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). Therefore, the evaluations may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328,336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider the district’s assertion of the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We will also consider your arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.111 for the information that is not subject to section 552.022.

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 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. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You argue the evaluations at issue consist of privileged attorney work product. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the evaluations at issue consist 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 evaluations at issue under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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 section 552.103(a) applies 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 requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

This office has long held that “litigation,” for purposes of section 552.103, includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

You assert litigation against the district is currently pending because concurrent with the district’s receipt of this request, the requestor filed an internal grievance with the district on behalf of her client. You explain grievances filed with the district are “litigation” in that the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You also explain the district’s policy includes a multi-level process whereby various administrators hear the grievances at Levels I and II, and the district’s board of trustees hears the grievance if the grievant appeals to Level III. You state during the hearings, the grievant is allowed to be represented by counsel, present favorable evidence in opposition to the district’s position, and present witnesses to testify on his behalf. You further inform us, the grievant must complete the grievance process before he can appeal to the Commissioner of Education, and eventually into district court. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district’s administrative procedure for disputes, as described above, is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. Thus, we find the district’s grievance procedures constitute litigation for section 552.103 purposes. Having reviewed your arguments and the information at issue, we find the district was a party to pending litigation on the date the district received the request. Further, we find the district has demonstrated the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is related to the pending litigation. Accordingly, we find the district may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.103.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending or anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for the submitted information.

In summary, the completed evaluations we have marked must be released under section 552.022 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KB-R/akg

Ref: ID# 570189

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)