



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 17, 2008

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Counsel  
Office of Legal Services  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2008-12811

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 322131.

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for nine categories of information regarding communications between named parties during specified time periods, two categories of information regarding state-reimbursed charges by named parties during specified time periods, copies of any verified financial statements filed by current members of the State Board of Education, and copies of all applications received by the agency in response to RFQ No. 701-08-013. You state that most of the responsive information will be released. You also state that the agency has redacted an insurance policy number pursuant to the previous determination issued to the agency in Open Records Letter No. 2007-05113 (2007). *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001). You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.136 of the Government Code. Further, although you take no position with regard to the remaining requested information you state that it may implicate the proprietary interests of Absey and Co. Inc. ("Absey") and StandardsWork, Inc. ("StandardsWork"). Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you state that you notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). 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 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from Absey or StandardsWork explaining how the release of the submitted information will affect their proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of Absey or StandardsWork. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret). Accordingly, the agency may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that Absey or StandardsWork may have in the information.

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information that falls within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, 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. *See* 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 Texas 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. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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). This means the communication 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 assert that the portion of the submitted information you have marked under section 552.107 consists of confidential communications between attorneys for the agency and agency staff and clients that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and that their confidentiality has been maintained. Based on this representation and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the agency may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides that “[n]otwithstanding 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 agency must withhold the account number you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted materials are copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).*

In summary, the agency may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The agency must withhold the account number you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information that is subject to copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

You also ask this office to issue a decision that would authorize the agency to withhold access device numbers from the public under section 552.136 of the Government Code without the necessity of again requesting a decision by this office under the Act. *See Gov’t Code § 552.301; ORD No. 673 (previous determinations).* We decline to issue such a decision at this time. 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,



Benjamin A. Diener  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 322131

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Edward E. Wilson  
President/CEO  
Absey and Co. Inc.  
23011 Northcrest Drive  
Spring, Texas 77389  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Barbara Davidson  
President  
1001 Connecticut Avenue NorthWest  
Suite 640  
Washington, DC 20036  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jennifer M. Canaday  
Senior Lobbyist  
305 East Huntland Drive, Suite 300  
Austin, Texas 78752  
(w/o enclosures)