



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 10, 2016

Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Deputy General Counsel, Governance
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, Sixth Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2016-25149

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 638767 (ORR# W001796-100616).

Texas A&M University-San Antonio (the "university") received a request for specified information pertaining to the requestor. The university claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 51.971 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) In this section:

¹We 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.

(1) "Compliance program" means a process to assess and ensure compliance by the officers and employees of an institution of higher education with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies, including matters of:

(A) ethics and standards of conduct;

(B) financial reporting;

(C) internal accounting controls; or

(D) auditing.

(2) "Institution of higher education" has the meaning assigned by Section 61.003.

...

(e) Information is excepted from disclosure under [the Act] if it is collected or produced:

...

(2) by a systemwide compliance office for the purpose of reviewing compliance processes at a component institution of higher education of a university system.

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (e)(2). We understand the university is an institution of higher education for purposes of section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(2). The university states the information it has marked under section 51.971 was collected or produced by the Texas A&M System Ethics & Compliance Office as part of a compliance review of compliance processes at the university, which is a component of the Texas A&M University System. Based on these representations, we agree the university must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(2) of the Education 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 "to facilitate 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 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 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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).

The university explains the remaining information constitutes or documents confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the university that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The university also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the university has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the university may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

To conclude, the university must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(2) of the Education Code. The university may withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/bw

Ref: ID# 638767

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)