



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 14, 2011

Ms. Leila Feldman
General Counsel
Fort Bend Independent School District
16431 Lexington Boulevard
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

OR2011-18417

Dear Ms. Feldman:

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# 438903 (FBISD PIR # 2011-12-101).

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district") received a request for documents pertaining to allegations made against a named district principal related to missing funds. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides in part that "[a] document

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

evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Act of May 25, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., H.B. 2971, § 1 (to be codified at Educ. Code § 21.355(a)). This office has interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. In Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996), we determined “administrator” in section 21.355 means a person who is required to and does in fact hold an administrator’s certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See* ORD 643 at 4. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded that a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for the purposes of section 21.355 where “it reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.).

You state, and provide documentation showing, the principal at issue held an administrator’s certificate under chapter 21 of the Education Code. You also state the principal was performing the functions of an administrator at the time of the evaluations. Upon review of the information at issue, we conclude the information we have marked constitutes an evaluation that is confidential under section 21.355 and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, we note the remaining information in Exhibit B consists of documents regarding an investigation of missing funds and an incident report. This information does not constitute an evaluation of the individual’s performance as an administrator for the purposes of section 21.355. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information constitutes evaluations subject to section 21.355 of the Education Code, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

You claim the submitted incident report is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.107 of the Government Code, which protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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, orig. proceeding). 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).

In this instance, you state the district sought legal advice from its attorney in regards to the criminal investigation at issue in the report. However, you do not explain how the incident report constitutes or documents a confidential communication between the district and its attorney that was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. Consequently, you have failed to demonstrate how the incident report constitutes or documents a privileged attorney-client communication. Thus, the district may not withhold the incident report under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information at issue relates to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). You state the incident report pertains to a concluded criminal investigation conducted by the district’s police department that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

Section 552.108, however, does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the district may withhold the incident report under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The district may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individuals concerned elected confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employees whose personal information is at issue timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. If the employees did not timely elect to withhold their personal information, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Except for basic information, the district may withhold the submitted incident report under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the employees whose personal information is at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The remaining information must be released.

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.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ana Carolina Vieira', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/agn

Ref: ID# 438903

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)