



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

August 18, 2008

Mr. Douglas L. Hibbard
Bracewell & Giuliani, LLP
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002-2770

OR2008-11240

Dear Mr. Hibbard:

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# 319342.

The Humble Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all information pertaining to the requestor and his two children. You state that the district released some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ 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 Education 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

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Furthermore, we note that, in this instance, the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 is section 552.107. See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6.

purposes of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² 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 for our review redacted and unredacted education records. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue, 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. § 99.3. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.³ 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.⁴ 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 assertion of this privilege under section 552.107.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some 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). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX.

²A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

³In 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.

⁴Ordinarily, 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); ORD 431 at 3.

R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “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).

Whether a communication meets this definition 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) 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 explain that the information at issue consists of communications between the district’s legal counsel and district representatives, made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You also inform us that the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your arguments and our review of this information, we conclude that the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the district may withhold under section 552.107.

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 such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 319342

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Stephanie S. Rosenberg
P.O. Box 2000
Humble, Texas 77345-2000
(w/o enclosures)