



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 15, 2008

Ms. Jennifer F. Simons
Chamberlain, Hrdlicka, White, Williams & Martin, PPC
1200 Smith Street, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2008-14113

Dear Ms. Simons:

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# 324635.

The Not Your Ordinary School Charter School (the "NYOS"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim that the requested information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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 purposes 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

¹A 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>.

submitted for our review 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 and that their right of access prevails over a claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code.² *See* 20 U.S.C § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education record. 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 assertion of this privilege. We also will address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access under FERPA.

Next, we note a portion of 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 contains a completed report made for the NYOS. Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022, the NYOS must release the completed report we have marked unless it is confidential under other law or is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. The NYOS raises sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code for the completed report. Sections 552.103 and 552.107 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't

²In the future, if the NYOS does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records, and the NYOS 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); ORD 431 at 3.

Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are not other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the NYOS may not withhold the completed report, which we have marked, under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that makes information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney-client privilege is also found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We will therefore consider your attorney-client privilege argument for the submitted report under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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 do the following: (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* ORD 676. 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, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You explain, and have submitted documentation demonstrating, that the submitted report constitutes a confidential communication from an attorney for the NYOS to the NYOS governing board that was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert the communication was intended to be confidential and that its confidentiality has been maintained. Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established that the submitted report is a privileged attorney-client communication that the NYOS may withhold pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

We will now address your claim under section 552.107 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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. *See 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 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. *See* 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), 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. *See 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You explain, and have submitted documentation demonstrating, that the remaining submitted information constitutes confidential communications from an attorney for the NYOS to a member of the NYOS governing board that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and that their confidentiality has been maintained. Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established that the remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the NYOS may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code.⁴

In summary, the NYOS may withhold the marked report pursuant to Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The NYOS may also withhold the remaining information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. This ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the NYOS determine that all or portions of the submitted information consist of "education records" subject to FERPA, the NYOS must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act.

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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.


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,



Laura Ream
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LR/eeg

Ref: ID# 324635

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James M. Terry, Jr.
Ross Law, P.C.
1104 San Antonio Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)