



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 26, 2017

Ms. Karla Schultz
Counsel for the Alpine Independent School District
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Russo & Kyle, P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2017-16739

Dear Ms. Schultz:

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# 667706.

The Alpine Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to internal investigations of district employees over a specified time period. You state you have redacted student-identifying 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 claim the submitted

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>.

information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state some of the submitted information includes information the Texas Education Agency (the “TEA”) may consider confidential. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the district notified the TEA of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the TEA. We have considered considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(3) provides for the required public disclosure of “information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body” unless it is “made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]” *Id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Although you raise sections 552.107 and 552.108 of the Government Code for this information, and the TEA raises sections 552.103 and 552.116 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary in nature 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 may be waived), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.108 subject to waiver); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, or 552.116. However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022. We will also address submitted arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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

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

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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is "realistically contemplated." *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld from disclosure if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result"). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 452 at 4.

The TEA states the information not subject to section 552.022 is related to an open investigation by the TEA into allegations that an educator engaged in inappropriate conduct. The TEA states the alleged misconduct may require the TEA to file a petition for sanctions against the educator pursuant to provisions of the Education Code and title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code. *See* Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a) (TEA shall regulate and oversee standards of conduct of public school educators), .041(b) (TEA shall propose rules providing for disciplinary proceedings); 19 T.A.C. §§ 247.2, 249.15(c). The TEA explains if the educator files an answer to the petition, the matter will be referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings for a contested case proceeding. *See* 19 T.A.C § 249.18. The

TEA states such proceedings are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (the “APA”), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. *See* Educ. Code § 21.041(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.4(a)(1); Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constitutes litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor to section 552.103). Based on these representations and our review, we find litigation was reasonably anticipated when the TEA received the instant request. Further, the TEA explains the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation because it was compiled for the purpose of investigating the educator’s alleged misconduct. Therefore, we conclude the district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the TEA.³

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. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence 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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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 assert the information subject to section 552.022 consists of privileged attorney-client communications. You state the information at issue “reflect[s] information that was communicated between [the district] and its attorneys.” Upon review, however, we find the information at issue was communicated with an individual whom you have not identified or otherwise established is a privileged party. Therefore, we find the district has not established the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

In summary, the district must release the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the remaining information on behalf of the TEA 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Taylor".

Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/bw

Ref: ID# 667706

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)