



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 5, 2016

Ms. Lauren Wood
Counsel for Collin College
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Hullett, P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070

OR2016-07644

Dear Ms. Wood:

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# 604548.

Collin College (the "college"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to incidents at a specified location during a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, as well as rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.² We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹You indicate the college sought and received clarification of the requests for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges, nor does it encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

Initially, as you acknowledge, the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office 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 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.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”). Some of the submitted information consists of redacted education records. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted 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. However, we note some of the submitted information was created and is maintained by the college’s police department (the “department”) for a law enforcement purpose. FERPA is not applicable to records that were created by a law enforcement unit of an educational agency or institution for a law enforcement purpose and that are maintained by the law enforcement unit. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3, .8. Accordingly, this information is not encompassed by FERPA and none of it may be withheld on that basis. Because we are able to discern the nature of the redacted information, we are not prevented from determining whether that information falls within the scope of the college’s claimed exceptions to disclosure. Accordingly, we will address the college’s arguments with respect to the information at issue, including the redacted information. Nevertheless, we caution the college that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information to be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of specific information requested or representative sample if information is voluminous).

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent 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 [of the Government Code][.]

³A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). This information, which we have marked, consists of a completed investigation and must be released unless it is either excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is confidential under the Act or other law. You do not claim section 552.108. Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections 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. 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) 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). Therefore, the college may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, you also raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, which the Texas Supreme Court has held are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your arguments under rule 503 and rule 192.5 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue is also subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code, which protects information made confidential under law, as well as section 552.130 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act.⁴ Thus, we will address the applicability of these exceptions to the information that is subject to section 552.022. We will also consider your arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.107 for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(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.

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

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The college 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 is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas 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). The college must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state, and submit documentation showing, prior to the date of the instant request, the employee at issue filed a lawsuit styled *Burleson v. Collin County Community College District*, Cause No. DC-14-09522, in the 160th District Court of Collin County. Upon review, we agree litigation was pending at the time of the present requests for information. You state the information at issue relates to the litigation because it pertains to the underlying employee retaliation claim in the lawsuit. Based on these representations, we find the college has demonstrated the information at issue is related to pending litigation. Therefore, the college may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.⁵

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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;

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

(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.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the information at issue includes confidential communications between the college and an attorney retained to represent the college. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of privileged communications for the purposes of rule 503. Accordingly, the college may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information may be withheld 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 when the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *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 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the documents at issue contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test may be withheld under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the purview 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 information at issue consists of privileged attorney work product. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. Therefore, the college may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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 section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (the "NCIC") or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means "information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions." *Id.* § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). *See generally* Gov't Code §§ 411.081-.1409. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except DPS may disseminate this

information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or F of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083(a). Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, any CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may not be made available to the requestor except in accordance with federal regulations. *See* ORD 565. Accordingly, the college must withhold the CHRI we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law and chapter 411 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.⁶ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Thus, the college must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We conclude the college must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the college may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The college must withhold: (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code; (2) the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (3) the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

⁶Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mili Gosar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mili Gosar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MG/akg

Ref: ID# 604548

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)