



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 28, 2017

Mr. Lucas Henry
Counsel for Frisco Independent School District
Abernathy Roeder Boyd Hullett
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2017-17003

Dear Mr. Henry:

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# 668587 (PIR No. MD-041817 & MD-050817).

The Frisco Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information related to a specified investigation, specified training documents pertaining to specified topics, and specified information relating to law firms retained or consulted by the district by the district during a specified time period.¹ You state you have released some of the requested information. We understand 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

¹You state the district sought and received clarification of the first request 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). We also note you sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the district received the required deposit on May 18, 2017. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

United States Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³ We have also received and considered comments submitted on behalf of the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information are 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; [and]

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (16). The submitted information includes a completed investigation which is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). Portions of the submitted information also consist of information that is in a bill for attorney's fees subject to section 552.022(a)(16). The information subject to section 552.022(a)(16) must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(16). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code for the submitted information, these sections are

²The 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>.

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.

discretionary exceptions to disclosure. See *Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to sections 552.022(a)(1) and 552.022(a)(16), which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. See *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your claims of the attorney-client and work product privileges under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure for the information at issue. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As this section protects information made confidential under law, we will address its applicability to the information at issue. In addition, we will consider the district’s arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.107 for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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). The 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 that (1) litigation is 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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.” *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the district’s receipt of the instant requests for information, the district received a letter notifying it of the requestor’s clients’ intent to seek reimbursement for specified costs from the district, pursuant to section 1412(a)(10)(C) of title 20 United States Code. Based on your representations, our review of the information at issue, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the district has established it reasonably anticipated litigation prior to the date it received the requests for information. We further find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, we conclude the district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

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 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).

We will now address your arguments against disclosure of the information subject to sections 552.022(a)(1) and 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Texas Rule of Evidence 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:

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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;

(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 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, orig. proceeding).

You assert the submitted fee bills include privileged attorney-client communications between attorneys for the district and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have established the information we have marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the district may withhold the information we have marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.⁵

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

However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of or documents privileged attorney client communications. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an e-mail was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue was communicated and it does not reveal a client confidence. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under rule 503.

We next address Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the remainder of the information at issue. 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.*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

You claim the remaining information at issue consists of attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or the attorney's representative that was developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial. We therefore conclude the district may not withhold the remaining information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.


Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district must release the remaining information subject to section 552.022 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,



Kaelan A. Henze
Attorney
Open Records Division

KAH/eb

Ref: ID# 668587

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)