



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 19, 2019

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

OR2019-23029

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# 788716 (ORR# 39019).

The Texas Education Agency ("TEA") received a request for information pertaining to the investigation of a named individual. TEA states it is redacting some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>1</sup> You also state the TEA is redacting information pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> TEA claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered the submitted argument and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</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 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. 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>.

<sup>2</sup> Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact the social security number of a living person without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

<sup>3</sup> We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

TEA acknowledges the submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public 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 expressly confidential under the Act or “other law.” Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). 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 TEA’s claim under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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 that 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”).

TEA informs us it “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 [c]hapter 21 of the Education Code.” *See* Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a), .041. TEA also explains it litigates enforcement proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (the “APA”), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 21.041(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.3. TEA states the submitted information consists of the entire case file pertaining to its investigation of alleged educator misconduct. It also states the file was created by attorneys, legal staff, and other representatives of TEA in anticipation of litigation. Based on these representations, we conclude TEA may withhold the submitted information as core attorney work product under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

You ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the TEA to withhold certain information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 without the necessity of requesting a decision under section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a) (allowing a governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jesse Harvey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JH/be

Ref: ID# 788716

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)