



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 26, 2011

Ms. Debra L. Goetz
Atlas & Hall, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 3725
McAllen, Texas 78502-3725

OR2011-01367

Dear Ms. Goetz:

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# 407016.

The McAllen Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all written files, notes, and any other information pertaining to a specified grievance filed with the district. You claim that the submitted information is excepted 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 a portion of the submitted information was created after the request was received. This information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the district is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office 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 or an adult student's 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 records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA should be made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted responsive records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, ~~we will consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted responsive information.~~

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

For the purposes of section 552.103(a), litigation includes civil lawsuits and criminal prosecutions, as well as proceedings that are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, or are otherwise conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991), 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982). You state the district is currently a party to ongoing grievance proceedings and that the submitted information is directly related to these ongoing grievance proceedings. However, you have not explained how the grievance process constitutes litigation of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature for purposes of section 552.103. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 301 (1982) (discussing meaning of "litigation" under predecessor to section 552.103). Further, although you state the district anticipates litigation regarding this matter from the requestor, you have not informed us, nor does the submitted information reveal, that the requestor has actually threatened litigation against the district or otherwise taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the district. Consequently, you have not established that litigation was pending or that the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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. 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 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). 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.*, 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 pet.). 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 state some of the remaining information consists of communications between attorneys for the district and district employees. You state that these communications were made in the furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district and were not disclosed to any other person other than the person to whom they were made. Upon review, ~~we find the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.~~ However, you have not shown the remaining information constitutes communications made for the furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services made between privileged parties. Accordingly, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

The remaining information includes an e-mail address subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).² Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, this e-mail address, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release.³

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release. The remaining responsive information must be released to this requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).*

³Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 407016

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)