



Jacob Woolston
Staff Attorney

January 27, 2022

**via First Class U.S. Mail and
CERTIFIED MAIL/RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
7021 0950 0001 2687 8338**

The Honorable Ken Paxton
Attorney General of Texas
Office of the Attorney General
209 W. 14th St., 6th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701

ATTN: Open Records Division

Re: RRISD / Request for Public Information Determination - TPIA 2022-281 – 15-day Letter

Dear Attorney General Paxton:

Round Rock Independent School District (“RRISD”) previously submitted, on September 14, 2021, a request for authorization to withhold certain information that the District believes is not subject to and/or is excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act.

The District received a request for public information via email January 5, 2022¹ From Robert Montoya , for communications in the possession of Trustees Xiao, from November 24, 2021 to December 4, 2021. Due to Round Rock ISD being closed on January 17, 2022. The 10th business day from the date of receipt is January 20, 2022 The 15th business day from the date of receipt is January 27, 2022.

REQUEST FOR DECISION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §552.301

The information that requires a determination from your office is being submitted under this cover. ² By copy of this letter, RRISD hereby provides notice to the Requestor that we have requested an opinion from your office on whether the requested information is public under the Public Information Act. This request is being submitted pursuant to Texas Government Code Section 552.301 and the identified exemptions herein.

Any information that we determine to be public information will be submitted to the Requestor upon receipt of any required payment.

¹ Exhibit 1: Public Information Request

² Exhibit 2: Documentation for review

EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §552.103

Section 552.103(a) of the Act, commonly referred to as the “litigation exception,” excepts from required public disclosure:

[I]nformation 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.

Section 552.103(a) was intended to prevent the use of the Public Information Act as a method of avoiding the rules of discovery used in litigation. This exception enables a governmental body to protect its position in litigation “by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery” procedures. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. As such, section 552.103 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Further, a governmental body waives section 552.103 by failing to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

1. Governmental Body’s Burden

For information to be excepted from public disclosure by section 552.103(a), (1) litigation involving the governmental body must be pending or reasonably anticipated and (2) the information must relate to that litigation. Therefore, a governmental body that seeks an attorney general decision has the burden of clearly establishing both prongs of this test.

For purposes of section 552.103(a), a contested case under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), Government Code chapter 2001, constitutes “litigation.” Questions remain regarding whether administrative proceedings not subject to the APA may be considered litigation within the meaning of section 552.103(a). In determining whether an administrative proceeding should be considered litigation for the purpose of section 552.103, the attorney general will consider the following factors: (1) whether the dispute is, for all practical purposes, litigated in an administrative proceeding where (a) discovery takes place, (b) evidence is heard, (c) factual questions are resolved, and (d) a record is made; and (2) whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction.

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Section 552.103(a) requires concrete evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated; it must be more than conjecture. The mere chance of litigation is not sufficient to trigger section 552.103(a). The fact that a governmental body received a claim letter that it represents to the attorney general to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, Civil Practice and Remedies Code chapter 101, or applicable municipal ordinance, shows that litigation is reasonably anticipated. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor the attorney general will consider in determining from the totality of the circumstances presented whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated.

In previous open records decisions, the attorney general had concluded that a governmental body could claim the litigation exception only if it established that withholding the information was necessary to protect the governmental body's strategy or position in litigation. However, Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990) significantly revised this test and concluded that the governmental body need only establish the relatedness of the information to the subject matter of the pending or anticipated litigation. Therefore, to meet its burden under section 552.103(a) in requesting an attorney general decision under the Act, the governmental body must identify the issues in the litigation and explain how the information relates to those issues. When the litigation is actually pending, the governmental body should also provide the attorney general a copy of the relevant pleadings.

2. Only Circumstances Existing at the Time of the Request

Subsection (c) of section 552.103 provides as follows:

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.

Consequently, in determining whether a governmental body has met its burden under section 552.103, the attorney general or a court can only consider the circumstances that existed on the date the governmental body received the request for information, not information about occurrences after the date of the request for information.

3. Temporal Nature of Section 552.103

Generally, when parties to litigation have inspected the records pursuant to court order, discovery, or through any other means, section 552.103(a) may no longer be invoked. In addition, once litigation is neither reasonably anticipated nor pending, section 552.103(a) is no longer applicable. Once a governmental body has disclosed information relating to litigation, the governmental body is ordinarily precluded from invoking section 552.103(a) to withhold the same information. This is not the case, however, when a governmental body has disclosed information to a co-defendant in litigation, where the governmental body believes in good faith that it has a constitutional obligation to disclose it.

4. Scope of Section 552.103

Section 552.103 applies to information that relates to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation, which is a very broad category of information. The protection of section 552.103 may overlap with that of other exceptions that encompass discovery privileges. However, the standard for proving that section 552.103 applies to information is the same regardless of whether the information is also subject to a discovery privilege.

For example, information excepted from disclosure under the litigation exception may also be subject to the work product privilege. However, the standard for proving that the litigation exception applies is wholly distinct from the standard for proving that the work product privilege applies. The work product privilege is incorporated into the Act by section 552.111 of the

Government Code, not section 552.103. If both section 552.103 and the work product privilege could apply to requested information, the governmental body has the discretion to choose to assert either or both of the exceptions. However, the governmental body must meet distinct burdens depending on the exception it is asserting. Under section 552.103, the governmental body must demonstrate that the requested information relates to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation. Under the work product privilege, the governmental body must demonstrate that the requested information was created for trial or in anticipation of civil litigation by or for a party or a party's representative.

The District was notified of the lawsuit³ in Exhibit #3A on August 16, 2021, when an attempt to serve was unsuccessfully attempted. The lawsuit was formally served on August 31, 2021. Exhibit #3A includes the Case Summary showing the unsuccessful service and the 1st Amended Petition. The District was made aware of the lawsuit in Exhibit 3B on about September 22, 2021. The substance of this request is clearly related to the substance of the lawsuits. In addition, the District was clearly aware of the lawsuits by the time this request was made

EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §552.107

G. Section 552.107: Certain Legal Matters

Section 552.107 of the Government Code states that information is excepted from required public disclosure if:

- (1) it is information that the attorney general or an attorney of a political subdivision is prohibited from disclosing because of a duty to the client under the Texas Rules of Evidence or the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct; or
- (2) a court by order has prohibited disclosure of the information.

This section has two distinct aspects: subsection (1) protects information within the attorney-client privilege, and subsection (2) protects information a court has ordered to be kept confidential.

1. Information Within the Attorney-Client Privilege

When seeking to withhold information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code based on the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body should assert section 552.107(1). In Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002), the attorney general interpreted section 552.107 to protect the same information as protected under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Thus, the standard for demonstrating the attorney-client privilege under the Act is the same as the standard used in discovery under rule 503. In meeting this standard, a governmental body bears the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the attorney-client privilege.

First, the governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. Third, the governmental body must

³ Exhibit 3: Case Summaries and Petitions

demonstrate that the communication was between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. Fourth, the governmental body must show that the communication was confidential; that is, the communication was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: to (A) whom disclosure is made to furtherance the rendition of professional legal services to the clients; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” Finally, because the client can waive the attorney-client privilege at any time, the governmental body must demonstrate that the communication has remained confidential.

The privilege will not apply if the attorney or the attorney’s representative was acting in a capacity “other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client.” In *Harlandale Indep. Sch. District v. Cornyn*, the Third Court of Appeals addressed whether an attorney was working in her capacity as an attorney when she conducted a factual investigation, thus rendering factual information from the attorney’s report excepted from public disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. There, the Harlandale Independent School District hired an attorney to conduct an investigation into an alleged assault and render a legal analysis of the situation upon completion of the investigation. The attorney produced a report that included a summary of the factual investigation as well as legal opinions. While the court of appeals held the attorney-client privilege does not apply to communications between an attorney and a client “when the attorney is employed in a non-legal capacity, for instance as an accountant, escrow agency, negotiator, or notary public,” the court also held the attorney in that case was acting in a legal capacity in gathering the facts because the ultimate purpose of her investigation was the rendition of legal advice. Thus, when an attorney is hired to conduct an investigation in his or her capacity as an attorney, a report produced by an attorney containing both factual information and legal advice is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.107(1).

If a governmental body demonstrates that any portion of a communication is protected under the attorney-client privilege, then the entire communication will be generally excepted from disclosure under section 552.107. However, section 552.107 does not apply to a non-privileged communication within a privileged communication, if the non-privileged communication is maintained by the governmental body separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communication. For example, if an e-mail string includes an e-mail or attachment that was received from or sent to a non-privileged party, and the e-mail or attachment that was received from or sent to the non-privileged party is separately responsive to the request for information when it is removed from the e-mail string and stands alone, the governmental body may not withhold the non-privileged e-mail or attachment under section 552.107.

The scope of the attorney-client privilege and the work product privilege, which is encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code, are often confused. The attorney-client privilege covers certain communications made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services, while the work product privilege covers work prepared for the client’s lawsuit. For materials to be covered by the attorney-client privilege, they need not be prepared for litigation.

The request seeks communications between Trustees and RRISD’s Staff Attorney Jacob Woolston and Doug Poneck, outside Board Counsel. These communications were to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client, RRISD, as indicated by a statement in the exchange. The communication was intended to be confidential. RRISD has not waived the privilege with respect to these communications. 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 v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE §552.026 and §552.114


The District has redacted information pursuant to §552.026 and §552.114 and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (20 U.S.C. Section 1232g(a)(4)). This information is marked for your convenience because it is included with information that is otherwise public.

Conclusion

We respectfully request that this request for information be reviewed for a determination by your office to protect any and all information that is deemed excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at 512.464.5451.

Sincerely,



Jacob Woolston
Staff Attorney
Round Rock ISD

Enclosure(s)

cc: *Ms. Robert Montoya*
Via email rmontoya@texasscorecard.com
w/o Enclosures