



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 24, 2017

Mr. Lucas Henry  
Counsel for the Coppell Independent School District  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75069

OR2017-24255

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# 681450 (File No. 1074).

The Coppell Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for specified legal expenses. The district states it has redacted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>1</sup> The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under

---

<sup>1</sup>The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. We note parents have a right of access under FERPA to their own child's education records. See 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; see also *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>. The DOE has also informed us that a parent's right of access under FERPA to information about the parent's child does not prevail over an educational institution's right to assert the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. Therefore, we will address the district's assertions of these privileges. We also will consider the district's arguments with respect to the remaining responsive information.

rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, the district informs us portions of the submitted information are not responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the district is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for required public disclosure of “information that is in a bill for attorney’s fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]” unless the information is confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(16). The district seeks to withhold the submitted responsive information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 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 Gov’t Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (attorney-client privilege under Gov’t Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider the district’s assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and the attorney work-product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 for the submitted responsive information. Further, because section 552.136 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information at issue.<sup>2</sup>

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

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;

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(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 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).

The district asserts the submitted responsive attorney fee bills must be withheld in their entirety under rule 503. However, section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code provides information "that is *in* a bill for attorney's fees" is not excepted from required disclosure unless it is confidential under other law or privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16) (emphasis added). This provision, by its express language, does not permit the entirety of an attorney fee bill to be withheld. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 (attorney fee bill cannot be withheld in entirety on basis it contains or is attorney-client communication pursuant to language in section 552.022(a)(16)), 589 (1991) (information in attorney fee bill excepted only to extent information reveals client confidences or attorney's legal advice). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the entirety of the fee bills at issue under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

The district also asserts the fee bills at issue include privileged attorney-client communications between attorneys representing the district and district representatives in their capacities as clients. The district states the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. The district states the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has established some of the information at issue, which we marked, constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the district may withhold the information we marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the remaining information either reveals a communication with a party the district has not identified as privileged or is not a communication. 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 the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney client communications. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under rule 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* ORD 677 at 9-10. 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

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d at 427.

The district contends the remaining information at issue constitutes attorney work product protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the remaining information consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of trial. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines "access device" as "a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument." *Id.* § 552.136(a). Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, this ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the district is not required to release such information in response to this request. The district may withhold the information we marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining responsive information.

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](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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/tdw

Ref: ID# 681450

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)