



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 18, 2013

Ms. Ellen H. Spalding
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2013-12361

Dear Ms. Spalding:

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# 493474 (TPIA No. 3545).

The Eanes Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified letter. You state the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, you state the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2013-06340 (2013). In that ruling, we determined the district (1) may withhold some of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code because the

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA 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 purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

²We assume the "representative sample" of information submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

district was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the previous request for information and (2) must release the remaining information. In this instance, you inform us the administrative proceeding at issue in the prior ruling was heard by the district's board of trustees (the "board") prior to the date the district received the instant request for information. Therefore, we find the law, facts, and circumstances on which the previous ruling was based have changed. Consequently, you may not rely on Open Records Letter No. 2013-06340 as a previous determination with regard to the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). Accordingly, we will address the submitted arguments against release of the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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 to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received 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, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

This office has long held "litigation," for purposes of section 552.103, includes "contested cases" conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard,

factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state the requestor has filed complaints with the State Bar of Texas against three attorneys associated with the district. You have not explained how the district is a party to any litigation involving the State Bar of Texas complaints. Thus, the district has failed to demonstrate how it was a party to pending litigation on the date it received the instant request. Further, you have provided an e-mail dated March 7, 2013, in which the requestor accuses the district of libel and slander. You state the district interprets this e-mail to be a threat of litigation. However, upon review of your arguments, we find you have not provided this office with evidence the requestor had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the district received the instant request for information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Thus, the district has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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. *See 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 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 claim the information you have marked is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving employees and attorneys of the district. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides that “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act],” unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

is specifically excluded by subsection (c).⁴ Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note the requestor has a right of access to her own e-mail address. *See id.* § 552.137(b). Upon review, we find the e-mail address we have marked is not of the types specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to disclosure.

In summary, the district may withhold the information you 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 affirmatively consents to disclosure. The district must release the remaining information.⁵

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/tch

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵As previously noted, the requestor has a right of access to her own personal e-mail address in the information that is being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b) (personal e-mail address of member of public may be disclosed if owner of address affirmatively consents to its disclosure). Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the district receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have such a right of access, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the district to redact this requestor's personal e-mail address. *See* ORD 684.

Ref: ID# 493474

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)