



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 28, 2006

Ms. Amanda M. Bigbee
Henslee, Fowler, Hepworth & Schwatz, L.L.P.
Burleson Independent School District
306 West 7th Street, Suite 1045
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2006-13921

Dear Ms. Bigbee:

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# 265526.

The Burleson Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding a named student in the district, information regarding a named district volunteer, information regarding a specified school activity, and any investigation concerning injuries to district students on sponsored field trips within the last five years. You state the district has released some information but you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.135, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

First, we note that recently, the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and

¹Although you initially raised sections 552.102 and 552.117 of the Government Code, you have not submitted any arguments regarding the applicability of these exceptions nor have you identified any information you seek to withhold under these exceptions. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert these exceptions to disclosure. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Privacy Act (“FERPA”), 20 U.S.C. §1232g, 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 Public Information Act (the “Act”). 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, among other things, redacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.² We will, however, address the applicability of the remaining claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

You claim all of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 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 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 that the section 552.103 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 that the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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

²In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

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.

To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must furnish evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981). A governmental body may also establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated by the receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990).

On the other hand, this office has determined that 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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You argue that the district reasonably anticipates litigation because the requestor is an attorney who represents a district student who was “allegedly physically assaulted” at a district-sponsored event. However, you do not inform us of any objective steps the requestor or his client have made towards initiating litigation against the district. As such, based upon our review of your arguments and the information you provided, we find that the district has not demonstrated that it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. Accordingly, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted

suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683. Although you argue the home address and telephone numbers in the submitted information are protected by common-law privacy, this office has stated on several occasions that an individual's home address and telephone number is generally not protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of a person's home address and telephone number is not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers do not qualify as "intimate aspects of human affairs"). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege.³ 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). We note the attorney-client 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)(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 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 writ). 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

³Although you also raise the attorney-client privilege in conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code, we note that section 552.101 does not encompass the attorney-client privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-3 (2002) (section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges).

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 assert that the information submitted in Exhibit B constitutes communications protected by the attorney-client privilege. You state that this information was communicated between district personnel and district attorneys during the provision of legal services to the district. You state that the confidentiality of this information has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree Exhibit B is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the district may withhold this information under section 552.107.⁴

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code generally excepts information held by a law enforcement agency that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime, if release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Gov't Code* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986).

A school district is not a law enforcement agency. By its terms, section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or a prosecutor. This office has determined, however, that where an incident involving alleged criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that relates to the incident. *See Open Records Decision Nos.* 474 (1987), 372 (1983) (where incident involving allegedly criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to incident). Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the agency having custody of the information may withhold the information under section 552.108 if the agency demonstrates that the information relates to the pending case and provides this office with a representation from the law enforcement entity that the law enforcement entity wishes to withhold the information. In this instance, the district has not provided any representation to indicate that a law enforcement agency wishes to withhold the information at issue. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your claim that portions of the submitted information are protected by section 552.135 of the Government Code. This section provides in relevant part:

⁴As our ruling on this issue is dispositive of Exhibit B, we need not address your remaining argument under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

(a) “Informer” means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s or persons’ possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer’s name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Id. § 552.135(a), (b). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of “law,” a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Furthermore, section 552.135 only protects information that identifies an “informer” as defined by subsection (a). *See id.* § 552.135(a). Upon review, we find that the district has not demonstrated that any individual identified in the submitted information reported a possible violation of a specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law. *See id.* We therefore conclude that the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.135 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). *See Gov’t Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public,” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses we have marked in the submitted information are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, the district must withhold these e-mail addresses in accordance with section 552.137 unless the district receives consent for their release.

In summary, this ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the district determine that all or portions of the submitted information consists of education records subject to FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act. The district may withhold the information in Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The e-mail addresses we have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the district receives consent for their release. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited

from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/eb

Ref: ID# 265526

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael L. Peck
306 West 7th Street, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)