



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 4, 2008

Ms. Elneita Hutchins-Taylor
Houston Independent School District General Counsel
Hattie Mae White Educational Support Center
4400 West 18th Street
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

OR2008-02924

Dear Ms. Hutchins-Taylor:

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# 303671.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the "Hightower Report". You state that the "Factual Analysis" section of the report has been released. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, 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.¹ Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). You have submitted unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address FERPA with respect to these records, other than to note that parents have a right of access to their own child's education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R.

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the attorney general's website, http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og_resources.shtml.

§ 99.3. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.² The DOE also has informed this office, however, that a parent's right of access under FERPA to information about that parent's child does not prevail over an educational institution's right to assert the attorney-client privilege.³ Therefore, to the extent that the requestor has a right of access under FERPA to any of the information for which you claim the attorney-client privilege, we will address your claim.

We next note that the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

(a) the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under 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 consists of a completed report. Therefore, as provided by section 552.022, the district must release this information unless it is confidential under other law. The district raises section 552.107 for the completed report. Section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.107 is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.107.

The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence and the 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). The attorney-client privilege also is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of this privilege under rule 503.

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

²In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records, and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

³Ordinarily, FERPA prevails over an inconsistent provision of state law. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F.Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995); Open Records Decision No. 431 at 3 (1985).

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).

Thus, 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. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Crop. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App. — Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You state that a portion of the submitted report consists of privileged attorney-client communications that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You have identified the parties to the communications. You also state that the communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established that the information at issue, which we have marked, is protected under the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. *See also Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney's entire investigative report was 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).

We note, however, that some of the remaining submitted information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it: (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person; and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). We have marked the medical information that must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, this ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the district determine that all or portions of the submitted information consist of "education records" subject to FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act. The district may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Finally, the district must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

such a challenge, 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 challenge that decision by suing the governmental 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Diener', enclosed within a circular scribble.

Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 303671

Enc. Submitted documents