



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 17, 2007

Ms. Lydia L. Perry
Law Office of Robert E. Luna, P.C.
4411 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75205

OR2007-12112

Dear Ms. Perry:

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# 289256.

The Lewisville Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to an incident involving the Flower Mound High School wrestling team. You state that you will provide a portion of the requested information to the requestor. You further state that you are redacting information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a).¹ You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

As a preliminary matter, you state that some of the information at issue has been previously addressed by this office in Open Records Letters Nos. 2006-02030 (2006) and 2005-11001 (2005). We presume that the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of these prior rulings. Thus, we determine that the district may continue to rely on these prior rulings with respect to any information requested in those instances that is also at issue here. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information

¹We note that our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made; therefore, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records.

are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). To the extent the requested information was not addressed in Open Records Letters Nos. 2006-02030 or 2005-11001, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

The district states that a portion of the submitted information pertains to confidential communication between an attorney and client. Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107. 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). 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).

You state that the submitted information includes a communication between the superintendent and an attorney representing the district. Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find that you have established that

the information you have marked constitutes a privileged attorney-client communication. Thus, this marked information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107.

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). The district may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the district must withhold the employees' home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and any information that reveals whether these employees have family members pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

Finally, you state the submitted information contains e-mail addresses. Section 552.137 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 at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked as well as the email addresses we have marked under section 552.137.

In summary, the district may continue to rely upon Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-02030 and 2005-11001 to the extent that the requested information is covered by these rulings. The district may withhold the information marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information marked under section 552.117 if the district employees made timely elections to keep their information confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Finally, the district must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137. The remaining 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,



Chanita Chantaplin-McLelland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CC/jb

Ref: ID# 289256

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Thomas J. Williams
Haynes & Boone, L.L.P.
201 Main Street, Suite 2200
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-3126
(w/o enclosures)