



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 16, 2006

Mr. Philip Marzec  
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.  
100 Travis Park Plaza Building  
711 Navarro  
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2006-05052

Dear Mr. Marzec:

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# 249068.

The San Antonio Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of any settlement agreement or any other document that details the amount paid in a specified financial settlement. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing for submission of public comments).

Initially, we note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

[T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

...

(18) a settlement agreement to which a governmental body is a party.

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (18). The submitted documents contain information relating to the expenditure of public funds by the district and a settlement agreement to which the district is a party. This information is subject to subsections 552.022(a)(3) and (18) and must be released unless expressly made confidential under other law. Sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to public disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. See Gov't Code § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); see also Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are not "other law" that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 or section 552.107.

The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. See *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney-client privilege is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503. We will also address your claims under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.135 of the Government Code, because they constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," including information that is encompassed by the common law right to privacy. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102 claims together. Information is protected from disclosure under the common law right to privacy if (1) it contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) it is not of legitimate concern to the public. See *id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. After reviewing the submitted information, we find that none of the information at issue is

private information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rule of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; 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 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).

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* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). 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, 4527 (Tex. App.—Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information). Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the submitted information reveals

confidential attorney-client communications. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld pursuant to rule 503.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. You do not inform us whether the district employee at issue timely elected to keep the information confidential. We therefore determine that if the individual at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1). If, however, the district employee at issue did not timely elect to keep the information confidential, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.135 provides in relevant part:

(a) "Informer" means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's or persons' possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer's name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.135(a)-(b). Section 552.135 protects an informer's identity. Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the submitted information identifies an informer. Thus, the district may not withhold any information under section 552.135.

We note that the submitted information contains a bank account number. Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(a) In this section, "access device" means 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:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. The district must withhold the account number we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that the submitted information contains a social security number. Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act. Therefore, the district must withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, if the individual at issue timely elected to keep her personal information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1). The district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to sections 552.136 and 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining 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 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jaime L. Flores  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLF/krl

Ref: ID# 249068

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Brian Collister  
Investigative Reporter  
Clear Channel Television  
News 4 WOAI TV  
P. O. Box 2641  
San Antonio, Texas 78299-2641  
(w/o enclosures)