



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 12, 2006

Mr. David A. Anderson
General Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2006-03656

Dear Mr. Anderson:

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# 246141.

The Texas Education Agency (the "TEA") received a request for information related to 2006 State Board of Educator Certification board meetings, including minutes, audiotapes, and notes taken during the meetings. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the common law right to privacy. Information must be withheld from the public under section 552.101 in conjunction with

¹ Although you did not raise sections 552.101 and 552.117 until the fifteen-business-day deadline, because sections 552.101 and 552.117 are mandatory exceptions, we will address the applicability of your arguments. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(b), .302.

² We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

common law privacy when the information is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The common law right to privacy encompasses the types of information that are held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See* 540 S.W.2d at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has determined that other types of information also are private under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has held to be private), 470 at 4 (1987) (illness from severe emotional job-related stress), 455 at 9 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 343 at 1-2 (1982) (references in emergency medical records to drug overdose, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illness, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental distress). Upon review, we find that the information you claim is protected by common law privacy is not intimate or embarrassing, and is therefore not private. Thus, the TEA may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

Next, we address your claim that section 552.107 of the Government Code applies to portions of the submitted information. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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 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, 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 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 inform us that a portion of the submitted information consists of confidential communications between the TEA and its attorneys, executives, and employees made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You have also identified for this office the individuals involved in these communications. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we agree that this information reflects privileged attorney-client communications. As such, the TEA may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, 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. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. We note that section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular number, provided that the cellular phone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)* (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular mobile phone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). The TEA may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made.

You state that the employee in question made a timely election under section 552.024. Therefore, provided that the TEA does not pay the cellular phone service for the number you have marked, the TEA must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). If, however, the TEA does pay the employee's cellular phone service, the cellular number must be released.

You also argue that some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. This provision 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. In addition, section 552.137 does not apply to a business’s general e-mail or website address.

You inform us that no member of the public whose e-mail address is at issue has consented to the release of their e-mail address, and you also represent that none of the e-mail addresses are a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, the TEA must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked in the remaining information under section 552.137, unless the TEA receives consent for their release.

In summary, (1) the TEA may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; (2) provided that the TEA does not pay the employee’s cellular phone service, the TEA must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(1); and (3) the TEA must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked in the remaining information under section 552.137, unless the TEA receives consent for their release. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/er

Ref: ID# 246141

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dianna Pharr
2204 Westlake Drive
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)