



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 14, 2019

Ms. Rebecca Bradley  
Counsel for the Plano Independent School District  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
P O Box 1210, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75069-1210

OR2019-16142

Dear Ms. Bradley:

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# 770728 (File Nos. 715 & 722).

The Plano Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified investigation.<sup>1</sup> You state the district has redacted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>The 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 an adult student's 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 educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.<sup>3</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state some of the submitted information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-00311 (2019). We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the district may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-00311 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) must be released unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision

---

<sup>3</sup>Although you also raise Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the work product privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.111 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 (2002). Further, although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.107 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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). Accordingly, we will consider your claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of 552.022, we will also consider the applicability of this section to this information. Additionally, we will address the district’s arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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;

(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).

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. *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). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

The district asserts the report subject to section 552.022(a)(1) consists of a privileged attorney-client communication between attorneys representing the district and district employees in their capacities as clients. The district states the communication at issue was made for the purpose of rendering professional legal services the district. The district also states the communication was intended to be and has remained confidential. Based upon the district's representations and our review, we find the district demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney's entire investigative report protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You claim the remaining information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information you have indicated consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees in their capacities as clients that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged party are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure.

to the requests for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” See Gov’t Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD 677 at 4-8. Rule 192.5 defines work product as

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

- a) 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 b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

*Nat’l Tank Co. 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; ORD 677 at 7.

The work product doctrine under section 552.111 of the Government Code is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. 1994); see *U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). Upon review, we find you have failed to establish the remaining information at issue consists of material prepared, mental

impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for the district or representatives of the district. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).<sup>5</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note, however, one of the requestors has a right to his own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *Id.* § 552.137(b). To the extent the remaining personal e-mail addresses are the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). To the extent the remaining personal e-mail addresses are not the personal e-mail addresses of the district officials or employees, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release or subsection (c) applies.

In summary, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the district may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-00311 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107 of the Government Code; however to the extent the non-privileged e-mails we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the remaining personal e-mail addresses are not the personal e-mail addresses of the district officials or employees, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release or subsection (c) applies. The remaining information must be released.

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.

---

<sup>5</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).

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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PS/be

Ref: ID# 770728

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requesters  
(w/o enclosures)