



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 1, 2014

Ms. Ellen H. Spalding
Counsel for the Klein Independent School District
Rogers, Morris & Grover, LLP
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2014-07257

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# 521442.

The Klein Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for nine categories of information relating to a specified incident involving the requestor, recordings of specified meetings, and the names of students who received truancy passes for a specified class. You indicate the district is withholding e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim 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 representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²We assume the "representative sample" of records 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 that submitted to this office.

Initially, the requestor claims the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements of the Act in requesting a ruling from this office. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e-1), a governmental body that submits written comments to the attorney general under section 552.301(e)(1)(A) must, within fifteen business days of receiving the request for information, send a copy of those comments to the person who requested the information from the governmental body. *See id.* § 552.301(e-1). The requestor claims the district failed to provide him with a copy of the enclosures provided to this office with its written comments submitted under section 552.301(e)(1)(A). We note section 552.301(e-1) does not require a governmental body to provide the requestor with enclosures, including copies of the specific requested information labeled to indicate why the claimed exceptions apply, that it submits to this office in connection with a request for ruling under section 552.301. We further note the requestor does not contend that he did not receive a copy of the district's written comments, and does not contend the district redacted information from the requestor's copy of the written comments. Consequently, we find the district complied with section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code in requesting this ruling.

Next, the district states it is withholding most of the requested information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. The requestor also contends the district failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code because the district "does not state with specificity why each requested document violates FERPA and which section(s) of FERPA apply to each document." The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office FERPA 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.³ 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"); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student's handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they would make identity

³A 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>.

of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). The district asserts FERPA applies to some of the requested documents. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing such records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the requested information. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the district. Accordingly, upon review, we find the district complied with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office with respect to the submitted information. Therefore, we will consider the district's arguments against disclosure 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, orig. proceeding); *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.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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). 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, and the submitted information reveals, prior to the date the district received the instant request for information, the requestor spoke with an attorney regarding the incident at issue. You also inform us the requestor contacted the district and stated he intended on filing a lawsuit and provided an oral settlement offer. The requestor claims he did not threaten to sue the district, has not retained a civil lawyer, and has not told the district he is preparing a lawsuit. The determination of whether the requestor retained an attorney and threatened to sue are questions of fact. This office cannot resolve disputes of fact in its decisional process. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 2 (1991), 552 at 4 (1990), 435 at 4 (1986). Where a fact issue cannot be resolved as a matter of law, we must rely on the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our opinion, or upon those facts that are discernible from the documents submitted for our inspection. ORD 552 at 4. Nevertheless, 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 request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Upon review, therefore, we find you have not established litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the district received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion 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 state some of the submitted information consists of communications involving outside counsel for the district and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were intended to be, and 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, which you have marked. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 521442

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)