



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 10, 2008

Mr. Robert E. Madding
Superintendent of Schools
Vidor Independent School District
120 East Bolivar
Vidor, Texas 77662

OR2008-07845

Dear Mr. Madding:

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# 312313.

The Vidor Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.114, and 552.135 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.²

Initially, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office that FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent,

¹Although you raise section 552.026 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, we note that section 552.026 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.026 provides that the Act does not require the release of information contained in education records except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"). Gov't Code § 552.026.

²To the extent any other responsive information existed on the date the district received this request, we assume the district has released it. If the district has not released any such records, it must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; see also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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”). We note that FERPA is not applicable to law enforcement records maintained by the district’s police department that were created by the department for a law enforcement purpose. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3, 99.8. You have submitted, among other things, unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA should be 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.⁴ Likewise, we do not address your arguments under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), 552.114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). However, we will consider your other arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides 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.

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>.

⁴In the future, if the district does obtain parental or an adult student’s 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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The district has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, 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 Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The district must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture."⁵ After review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that, for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code, you have not established that the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You next raise section 552.107 of the Government Code in regard to a portion of the submitted information. This section 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 "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 Inc. 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,

⁵Among 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).

lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, 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 explain that a portion of the submitted information consists of witness statements taken in connection with an investigation conducted by the district. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we find you have failed to establish that the submitted witness statements constitute or document privileged attorney-client communications; therefore, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Next, we note that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."⁶ Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201(a) of the Family Code provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

⁶The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 of the Government Code on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).*

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 17 relate to an investigation of alleged or suspected abuse of a child conducted by the district's police department and are therefore subject to section 261.201. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of section 261.201 as "person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes"), 261.001(1)(E) (definition of child abuse includes sexual assault or aggravated sexual assault under Penal Code sections 22.011 and 22.021). You do not indicate that the district's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. We therefore assume no such rule exists. Given this assumption, we conclude that Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 17 are confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code and must therefore be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code.⁷ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 21.12 of the Penal Code. Section 21.12(a) provides that "[a]n employee of a public or private primary or secondary school commits an offense if the employee engages in... (1) sexual contact, sexual intercourse, or deviate sexual intercourse with a person who is enrolled in a public or private primary or secondary school at which the employee works and who is not the employee's spouse[.]" Penal Code § 21.12(a)(1). We further note that section 21.12(d) provides that "[t]he name of a person who is enrolled in a public or private primary or secondary school and involved in an improper relationship with an educator as provided by subsection (a) may not be released to the public and is not public information under Chapter 552, Government Code." *Id.* § 21.12(d). Thus, the name of the student allegedly involved in an improper relationship with an educator, which we have marked, is confidential under section 21.12 and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). This exception applies when the release of information would result in a violation of the common-law right to privacy. *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, *writ ref'd n.r.e.*). The common-law right to privacy is violated if the information (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts about a person's private affairs such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is of no

⁷As this ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against the disclosure of this information.

legitimate concern to the public. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. 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. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, see Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, see Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); and identities of victims and sexual abuse, see Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Generally, however, the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. See Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern); 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We have reviewed the submitted documents and marked the information that is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate concern to the public. This marked information is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.102 of the Government Code. We find, however, that the remaining information is either not intimate or embarrassing or is a matter of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld under 552.102 on that basis.

Finally, you assert that some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.135 of the Government Code, which provides the following:

(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].

Gov't Code § 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). Additionally, we note that individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report are not informants for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the remaining information identifies an informer for purposes of section 552.135. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.135.

We note that portions of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁸ Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. However, information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the request for confidentiality is made after the request for the information at issue was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). In this case, you neither inform us nor provide documentation showing if or when the employees at issue elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Nevertheless, if the employees concerned timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, you must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employees did not make a timely election.⁹

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone numbers, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.¹⁰ Thus, the district must withhold the personal information of a peace officer we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

⁸ Unlike other exceptions to disclosure under the Act, this office will raise section 552.117 on behalf of a governmental body, as this exception is mandatory and may not be waived. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001) (mandatory exceptions).

⁹ Regardless of the applicability of section 552.117, section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

¹⁰ "Peace officer" is defined by Article 2.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

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 consist of "education records" subject to FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act. Pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code, the district must withhold (1) Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 17 in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code, and (2) the marked name of the student allegedly involved in an improper relationship with an educator in conjunction with section 21.12 of the Penal Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code to the extent that the employees concerned timely requested confidentiality for the information under section 552.024 of the Government Code. The district must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2). 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 312313

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Jerry Jordan
The Examiner Newspaper
795 Willow Street
Beaumont, Texas 77701
(w/o enclosures)