



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 13, 2004

Mr. Scott A. Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A&M University System  
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079  
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2004-5731

Dear Mr. Kelly:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 205077.

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for all records pertaining to the requestor, to include records held by the College of Liberal Arts, the Department of Political Science, the Provost's Office, the Office of General Counsel, and the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities. You advise that, with the exception of the information you have submitted for review, the university has released the requested information to the requestor.

You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We begin by noting that the submitted information is subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information, other than directory information, contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1), (d) (for student eighteen years of age or attending institution of postsecondary education, permission or consent required of and rights accorded to parent under FERPA are required of and accorded to student); *see also* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining personally identifiable information). "Education records" are those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A).

Under FERPA, a student has an affirmative right of access to the student's own education records. 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to the submitted records under FERPA in this instance. Accordingly, the records at issue generally may not be withheld pursuant to an exception to disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). See *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (federal law prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). However, the Family Policy Compliance Office of the United States Department of Education has informed this office that a student's right of access to the student's own education records under FERPA does not prevail over an educational agency or institution's right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code encompasses the attorney-client privilege. As you contend that portions of the submitted information, which you have marked, are protected by the privilege, we next consider your claim under section 552.107(1).

When asserting the attorney-client privilege pursuant to section 552.107(1), 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body.<sup>1</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.<sup>2</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made

---

<sup>1</sup> The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. See TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); see also *id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining "representative of the client," "representative of the lawyer.")

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).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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).

You state, and the documents reflect, that portions of the information submitted as Exhibits B-1 through B-4 documents or comprises confidential communications among university attorneys, officials, and staff made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the university. Furthermore, you indicate that the confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that you have demonstrated that the information you have marked in Exhibits B-1 through B-4 is protected by the attorney-client privilege. Accordingly, we find that the university may withhold this information from disclosure pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records

will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 205566

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joseph Michael Walker  
c/o Texas A&M University System  
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079  
College Station, Texas 77845-3424  
(w/o enclosures)