



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 5, 2017

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

OR2017-07155

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# 652143 (TEA PIR# 28830).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for the investigation file concerning the requestor. You state you will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we must address the requestor's assertion the agency failed to comply with the procedural obligations of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten

¹We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

business days after receiving the request for information. *See id.* § 552.301(b). The agency states it received the request for information on January 18, 2017. You state the agency maintained a skeleton crew day on January 19, 2017. We note this office does not count holidays, including skeleton crew days observed by governmental bodies, as business days for the purposes of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Thus, the agency was required to request a decision from this office pursuant to section 552.301(b) by February 2, 2017. The agency hand-delivered the information required by section 552.301(b) to this office on January 30, 2017. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we find the agency complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

Next, we note, and you acknowledge, some of the information at issue consists of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required 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 is made confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(1). You claim Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the information at issue. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your claim under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for this information. Further, we will consider your argument under section 552.103 against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

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).

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, the governmental body may assert the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the core work product aspect of the privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, 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 processes (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 "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 inform us 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 chapter 21 of the Education Code." *See* Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a), .041. You also explain 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 state the information you marked consists of the entire case file pertaining to the agency's investigation and analysis regarding the certification of an educator. You also state the file was created by attorneys, legal staff, and other representatives of the agency 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 and our review, we conclude the agency may withhold the information you marked as core attorney work product under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

- (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). The agency has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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 agency must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). We note contested cases conducted under the APA are considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *See* ORD 588 at 7. We further note a contested case before the State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") is considered litigation for the purposes of the APA. *See id.*

You state the submitted information is related to an open investigation into allegations that an educator engaged in inappropriate conduct. You state "[d]ue to the alleged misconduct, [the agency] filed a petition for sanctions against the educator pursuant to the provisions of the Education Code and title 19 of the Administrative Code" prior to the receipt of the request for information. *See* Educ. Code § 21.031(a) (the agency shall regulate and oversee standards of conduct of public school educators); 19 T.A.C. § 249.15(c) (agency staff may commence contested case to sanction teacher's certificate). You also inform us the matter was referred to the SOAH for a contested case proceeding. Furthermore, you state the agency's contested cases are governed by the APA. Based on your representations and our review, we determine litigation was pending on the date the agency received the request for information. Furthermore, upon review of the investigation records at issue, we find the information at issue relates to the pending litigation because it pertains to the basis of the pending litigation. Accordingly, the information you marked may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the agency may withhold the information you marked as core attorney work product under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The agency may withhold the information you marked 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, 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,



D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMC/nmd

Ref: ID# 652143

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)