



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 4, 2016

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Senior Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2016-07545

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# 604133 (TEA PIR# 26182).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for information pertaining to investigations regarding nine named educators. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You state you have redacted some 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.¹ You also state you have redacted social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is privileged under Texas Rule of Civil

¹The 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 student 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 this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

²We note section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Procedure 192.5. We have considered your argument and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

As you acknowledge, the submitted information consists of completed investigations 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

³We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 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, orig. proceeding).


Further, 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) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought process (citing *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993)); *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 the agency "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 the agency litigates enforcement proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, and rules adopted by the agency under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 21.041(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.3. You note the requestor seeks access to all documentation related to any investigation into the named educators. You state the requested information consists of the entire investigation files of the agency's investigations of alleged educator misconduct, and contains analysis pertaining to the certification of the specified educators. You also explain the file was created by attorneys, legal staff, and other representatives of the agency in anticipation of the 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 the agency 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.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 "Abigail T. Adams". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 604133

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)